

A N
E S S A Y
TOWARDS A ^{43/2.6.17.}₁₋₂₁
DEMONSTRATION
OF THE
Scripture-Trinity.

By the late learned *R*
DR. DANIEL SCOTT,
Author of the Appendix to *H. Stephens* Greek
Lexicon, in 2 Vols. Folio.

The THIRD EDITION.
To which is prefixed some Account of the
AUTHOR.

SHERBORNE:
Printed by R. GOADBY, and sold by GOADBY and
BERRY, Stationers, at the *Royal-Exchange*,
L O N D O N.





T H E

P R E F A C E.

RELIGION supposes Reason, and Revelation addresses itself to rational Beings, requiring not only a reasonable Service, but a reasonable Faith too. The Practice of the Christian Precepts will promote Habits conducive to our highest Happiness; and the Belief of the Christian Doctrines would furnish our Minds with an invaluable Treasure of useful Knowledge.

Real Knowledge is communicated by such Propositions as convey *Ideas*, and lay a foundation for a rational *Assent*. Undoubtedly, where there is no *Idea*, there can be no *Assent*; because *assenting to nothing* is the very same with *not assenting*. We assent as far as our *Ideas* reach, for we can do no more: We believe in part, what is revealed in part; our Faith keeping pace with our *Ideas*, and ending where they end.

iv The P R E F A C E.

There is to be sure a manifest Difference between assenting to this general Proposition, *God speaks a Truth*, and giving an Assent to that determinate Truth, which God speaks. May not a Man affix Ideas to the several Terms of a Proposition, and yet have no Idea of what is asserted in that Proposition? In which case he can give no Assent to it, more than this; That it is true in some Sense or other, or that something should be believed, if he understood what; which is not assenting to that Proposition, but to another; namely, that *whatever Scripture asserts is true*, or the like.

Are there none among us Christians, who, out of a misguided Zeal for God and his Revelation, mightily decry the Use of Reason in Religion, as not being its proper Province? Nay, are there none who seem to glory in putting their Reason to the stretch, and who labour to raise themselves to such a pitch of Faith, as to make the Incredibility of a Doctrine the very ground of their believing it? I don't so much wonder at this Conduct in the common People, the *vilis plebecula—quæ quicquid non intelligit, plus miratur*.

The P R E F A C E. v

miratur. But 'tis really astonishing to find learned Men guilty of this Affectation of advancing Faith on the Ruins of common Sense.

Reason is the inseparable as well as peculiar Glory of a reasonable Being, and was not designed, like our Cloaths, to be put on and off as Occasion requires; but was intended for our perpetual Use. And that we may use our Reason in religious as well as civil Matters, is as evident, as that a rational Being should *always* act reasonably; and of consequence, not only in civil Affairs, which are of less Importance; but more especially in religious Concerns, which are of infinitely greater Moment.

I allow the Deference that Reason owes to Revelation. *Where God doth interpose a definitive Sentence, our Reason has nothing to do but to attend and submit; no Right to vote, no Licence to debate the Matter; its Duty is to listen, and approve whatever God speaketh, to read and subscribe to whatever he writeth.*

But notwithstanding this Concession, surely Reason acts in Character, when it humbly endeavours to find out God's

Mind express'd in Scripture Words, and examines human Forms of Expression by sacred ones, which are the proper Test and Standard of revealed Truth.

This Discourse is called an *Essay*, &c. because, should it be thought by judicious Persons to fall short of a *strictly Mathematical Demonstration*, I hope it has so much the Air of one as to bid fair for it, and to deserve the Title of an *Essay towards it*, as carrying in it the force of a *solid Proof*. And there is sometimes in *Moral Probabilities*, an irresistible Strength, little short of the strictest Demonstration. There are many Things not capable of strict Demonstration, and yet so evident and undoubted, that a Man would forfeit the very Character of Sobriety and common Sense, that should seriously make the least Question of them. I won't say this Proof arises to such a pitch, as to bear me out in calling in Question the Understanding of my Readers, who cannot see the Force of it, the very *Thought* would be too assuming.

Besides.

The P R E F A C E. vii

Besides, as every Parent is apt to be prepossess'd in Favour of his own Offspring, whatever my own Opinion of this Performance may be, I would not dogmatically stile it a *Rigid Demonstration*, till it has passed the Verdict of many more competent Judges than myself; more competent, I say, as being Masters of superior Sense, and under less danger of a Bias in its favour.

By *Demonstration* I mean, a Chain of clear Reasoning, beginning from some plain and undoubted *Axiom*, or *Axioms*, and regularly descending by necessary Deductions, or close Connection of Ideas, till we come at our Conclusion.

The Force of such a Demonstration is almost irresistible; for it is very certain that neither Scripture nor Fathers can add force to, if concurring; nor, if reclaiming, be able to stand against, clear and evident Demonstration. Waterland.

As for the Word *Trinity*, I am not fond of it, because it is an unscriptural one; and, as far as I know, unknown to the Church for near 200 Years. It cannot be proved that any Writer before *Theophilus Antiochenus* (about A. D. 180) expressly

viii The P R E F A C E.

expressly gives the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit the Name of *Trinity*. However, since the Christian Church has been in possession of the Word ever since, I don't reject it; especially as no Objection can be raised against it, from its Obscurity: for, as Archbishop Tillotson says, *a Trinity is nothing but Three of any Thing* [Vol. 1, Sermon. 48. p. 493.] So a Trinity of Persons is no more than three Persons. And *the Trinity* signifies *the three Persons*.

The Reader will see I have kept close to my Subject and avoided all Harangues or Addresses to the Passions of those that differ from me. I have not run from the Point in question, screening myself under general and ambiguous Terms, insinuating what I will not say, and saying what I cannot prove. But have proposed my Arguments in their native Force, and am heartily desirous, others, who are differently minded, would take the same open Method to promote their own Sentiments. It is ungenerous and mean in any Cause (in this, it is impious) not to suffer all that can justly be pleaded on the

the

The P R E F A C E. ix

the opposite Side to appear in its full Light and Strength.

In short, in this Performance my Conscience bears me witness, that I have proceeded always with this Consideration, that I am to give a most strict Account of every Line, and Word, that passeth under my Pen: and therefore have been precisely careful for the Matter of my Book to defend Truth only, and only by Truth.

A Man that has once *drawn Blood in Controversy* (as Archbishop Tillotson expresses it) is seldom known ever perfectly to recover his own good Temper afterwards. I hope I am duly sensible of the Danger, and have been sufficiently upon my guard, endeavouring to promote the Truth with a Christian Temper. I would punctually observe the *Golden Rule* in my Conduct towards my Christian Brethren, whose involuntary Errors I look on rather as their Misfortune than their Crime: and therefore think it my Duty, rather to pity and pray for them as misled into Error, than censure and condemn them as wilfully departing from the Truth.

To

The P R E F A C E.

To conclude, I would not be understood by any Thing said in this Discourse, to charge the Trinitarians with professing to believe a Proposition, which they see to be absurd in itself, or derogatory from the Honour of the Father in its Consequences. No, I am persuaded an ardent Love to their dying Redeemer puts many of them on advancing him to an Equality with the Peerless Majesty of his God and Father. Neither do I doubt, but their grateful Piety to their Saviour will be rewarded with the discovery of many important Truths, when they arrive at that blessed Place, where all those Controversies in Religion, which are now so hotly agitated, will be finally determined; not as we endeavour to end them now, by Canons and Decrees; but by a perfect Knowledge and convincing Light. Archbishop Tillotson, Vol. I. *Serm.* VIII. p: 82. There they shall be taught (perhaps by CHRIST himself, whom they adore) what is the Honour respectively due to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

A SHORT



A SHORT
ACCOUNT
OF THE
AUTHOR.

THE Author of the following Tract was Dr. *Daniel Scott*, of whom it may be proper to give a short Account. His Father was an eminent Merchant in *London*. By his first Wife he had a Son, viz. Mr. *Thomas Scott*, a Dissenting Minister at *Norwich*, who published several occasional Sermons. He had, besides other Children, two Sons of considerable Note in the learned World, viz. Mr. *Thomas Scott*, a Dissenting Minister at *Ipswich*, Author of a Poetical Version of the Book of *Job*, with critical Notes, and some other Poetical Pieces; also Dr. *Joseph Nicol Scott*, who was first a Dissenting Minister, and published two Volumes

lumes of Sermons ; he afterwards practised Physic in *London*, and was well known by the Hand he had in several ingenious and useful Publications. Our Author was the Son of the abovementioned Mr. *Scott*, of *London*, by a second Wife. He was intended for the Ministry, and was several Years a Pupil under Mr. *Samuel Jones*, an eminent Tutor at *Tewksbury*, in *Gloucestershire*. After he had finished his Course of Academical Learning at *Tewksbury*, he remov'd to *Utrecht*, in *Holland*, and pursued his Studies there with indefatigable Zeal. There he was honoured with the particular Friendship of the learned Professors, and took his Degree of *Doctor of Laws*. An invincible Diffidence, and excessive Modesty, prevented his entering on the Ministry, though he was eminently qualified for it, not only by his great and almost unequal'd Learning, but by his fervent Piety, signal gentleness and tenderness of Spirit, and a solicitous Concern to do good to his Fellow-Christians. While he was at *Utrecht*, he saw Reason to alter his Sentiments concerning the Subject and Mode of

of Baptism, and thought it his Duty to join himself to a Church of *Mennonites*, or Baptists, in that City. But he always retained and manifested a most Catholic and benevolent Spirit, and joined in Communion with Christian Churches of other Denominations, as he had Opportunity.

Upon his return to *England*, he settled in *London*, or *Colchester*, and devoted his Time and Abilities to publish various learned and useful Treatises. All who intimately knew him (and he was known to many) could not but be sensible that he was a Person of the greatest Learning, critical Acumen and exactness, of the most gentle obliging Behaviour, and, which was still more to his Honor, of the most eminent Piety and Devotion, Integrity and Benevolence.

An ill State of Health, the Effect of a too close Application to Study, required an Avocation from it, and obliged him for several of the last Years of his Life, to spend Months in travelling and residing in different Parts of the Kingdom, where he could meet with agreeable Friends and Acquaintance. There was
no

no Person for whom he had a higher Esteem and Affection than Dr. *Doddridge*, and that Author's Treatise on the *Rise and Progress of Religion*, was his constant travelling Companion. Except in that one Point, to which the following Treatise refers, he nearly agreed in his Sentiments of the Doctrines of the Gospel, with that pious and excellent Writer, who in several Notes in his *Family-Expositor*, calls him the *learned, ingenious, candid and accurate* Dr. *D. Scott*, and esteemed his Friendship one of the greatest Blessings of his Life. Dr. *Scott's* great Piety and Benevolence led him to take peculiar Notice of Young Men. He laboured to form them to a Taste for reading and Knowledge, and above all, to cherish in them a serious, devout, humble and candid Spirit; he never conversed with them upon any of his particular Sentiments, or appeared solicitous to make Profelytes to these, but directed his friendly Endeavours to promote Wisdom and Piety in their Hearts, and his Labours of Love were not in vain. They revered and loved him as a Father, attracted by that sweetness of Temper,

and

and paternal Condescension, Freedom and Affection, with which he treated them. He continued single, and died suddenly in a Retirement near *London*, *March 29, 1759.*

Dr. *Scott*, in the Year 1741, published a *New Version of St. Matthew's Gospel, with critical Notes and an Examination of Dr. Mills's various Readings*, a most learned and accurate Performance! He likewise published 1745, an *Appendix to H. Stephens's Greek Lexicon*, in Two Volumes Folio, where his amazing Diligence, critical Skill and Precision, is more fully displayed. He dedicated those Volumes to Archbishop *Secker*, and Bishop *Butler*. These learned Prelates had been his Fellow-Pupils at *Tewksbury*, and honoured him with their Esteem, Friendship and Correspondence. But many of his Friends, and the Friends of sacred Literature regretted, that, by their Persuasion, he was engaged in this Work. For his close Application to it for many Years broke his Health and Spirits, and probably shortened his useful Life; not to add, he was a loser of several Hundred Pounds by this Publication.

cation. He intended to have drawn up and published a large Lexicon for the Greek Testament, (upon a Plan resembling *Pafor's*) with Remarks on the Use of the Words, and Illustrations of them from the *Greek Writers*, in the Manner of those in his Version of *St. Matthew's Gospel*; he had gone through the four first Letters of the *Greek Alphabet*, but was over-persuaded by his dignified Friends to draw up his Appendix instead of the Lexicon. The latter would have been a much more acceptable and useful Work, and he often regretted his yielding to their Persuasions.

His Essay towards a Demonstration of the Scripture-Trinity was first published A. D. 1724 or 1725. The anonymous Author was known by few; and it was generally ascribed to the Reverend and Learned Mr. *James Pierce* of *Exeter*, whose Sentiments on that Point, and his critical Skill were then well known.

The first Edition of this Work was so speedily disposed of, that the Author was much surpriz'd at so unexpected an Event, considering how obnoxious it might be supposed to have been to those
who

who are jealous for the established, or generally received Formularies upon that Point.

But he soon had sufficient Evidence to convince him that the Edition was bought up, and suppressed by an eminent Prelate, *Dr. Edmund Gibson*, who for Reasons, which may easily be guess'd at, thought this a better Way to prevent the spread of what he esteemed Error, than to attempt to confute the Reasoning of the Book itself.

A second Edition, with some Enlargements, was published in the Year 1738, even then it was so hard to be procured, that the Author and his particular Friends had some Grounds for Suspicion, if not certain Evidence, that dishonourable Methods were taken, to prevent the Knowledge and spread of that Edition. It is apprehended that every impartial Reader of it must allow, that his Method of stating this Doctrine is clear, simple, and honest. He defines his Terms with Precision and Accuracy, and doth not amuse or deceive his Readers with Words without Meaning, or vague and obscure Terms. He proceeds Step by Step to
his

his Conclusion, so that no unprejudiced Reader can reasonably object to his Method, or fail to see that there is at least some probable Ground to conclude, that his Corollaries and Consequences are natural, just and scriptural.

This Essay is an admirable Model for those who may engage in writing upon the most important Points, which are controverted among Christians. There appears through the whole an uncommon Spirit of Candour, Humility, and respect for the Learned, from whom he differs, and whose Mistakes and false Reasonings he thought it his Duty to point out. He discovers a truly amiable and Christian Spirit, and shews that the Disciple of the meek and benevolent *Jesus* was not lost in the Disputer of this World. The Author was desirous that this Essay should be more extensively useful than it was adapted to be in its original Form; on Account of the learned Quotations and remarks, with which it abounded. He therefore went over it with the Writer of this Account, whom he honour'd with his Friendship; and those Passages are marked which he thought

thought it proper to omit in another Edition. It is not worth troubling the Reader with the Reasons why it hath been so long delayed, it seem'd seasonable to publish it now, as the Controversy hath lately been renewed by the Publications of Mr. *Lindsay* and others. In this Edition, those Parts only are retain'd which the Author supposed the Generality of Readers capable of Understanding.

It is recommended to the unprejudiced and serious Perusal of those who are desirous to know the Truth, as it is in *Jesus*. It may not perhaps convince them that the Author's Reasoning is just and agreeable to the Scripture Standard. But it is hoped that it may abate the Confidence of some in their Assertions concerning this Doctrine, and the ignorant, unchristian and heterodox Severity, with which others Censure their differing Brethren; and that it may dispose other Readers to continue and improve in their Candour and Indulgence to all who may be of the Author's Sentiments: in this view the Publisher's Intention will be answered.

Though

Though this Essay hath not brought him entirely into the Author's Sentiments, yet it hath increased his Esteem and Affection for all pious and charitable Christians, whatever may be their different Sentiments concerning the important Doctrine. He wishes and prays that it may have the same good Effect in all who may peruse it.





A N

E S S A Y

TOWARDS A

DEMONSTRATION

O F T H E

Scripture-Trinity.



THE Scripture speaks of three Persons as more immediately concern'd in the important Affair of our Salvation.—They are stiled by the sacred Writers, the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. Mat. xxviii. 19.

That

That proper *Godhead* is somewhere to be found among the *Sacred Three* is allowed by all Christians; but whether it is peculiar to *One* of the Persons, or common to *All* of them, is Matter of Debate.—My Design being to present the Reader with the *Scripture-Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, I shall endeavour to prove from Holy Writ, that *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three distinct Persons, of which the Father only is properly and strictly God.*

But before I proceed to the Proof, give me leave to premise a few *Definitions* and *Axioms*, that so the principal Terms I make use of may be rightly understood, and the chief Principles I go upon may be clearly ascertained.

DEFINITION I.

By the Word *God*, I mean a *Spirit possessed of all possible Perfections.*

By a *Perfection*, I mean such a Quality as renders a Being, possessed of it, more compleat, excellent, or useful, than it would be without it. — Or in other Words, a *Perfection* is that which renders any one the Object of a reasonable Esteem
and

and Love, and furnishes him with a Capacity of Happiness and Usefulness.

Now I say no such Perfections are wanting in God; for He possesses all of them, and where they are capable of Degrees, He enjoys them in the highest possible Degree. This I add, because a less Degree of Perfection, compared with one infinitely greater, vanishes and loses its Name; and should it be justly ascrib'd to God, would argue him imperfect, and consequently not God. For the most essential Notion men have of God is, that He is a Being *absolutely perfect*, that is, as perfect as is possible.

From the foregoing Definition we may draw the following Corollaries or Inferences.

COROLL. I. If God be possessed of all Perfections, He is *Self-existent*.

To be *Self-existent* is to exist necessarily, independently and eternally.

A necessary, independent Being is properly what we term *Unoriginate*. He therefore that objects against this Corollary, must deny that God is eternal; and assert, that He is a derived Being; or maintain, that it is not more excellent to be Unoriginate and without Be-

ginning, than to be Derived, and of a limited Duration.—If God be Self-existent, all his Perfections must be as absolutely underived as his Existence. For as the Existence so must the Perfections be. — Self-existence can never signify a Thing's bringing itself into Being; for that would imply Existence before it was supposed to exist.

COROLL. II. From the absolute Perfection of the Deity, or *God*, follows his *Simplicity*, or *perfect Freedom* from any Manner of *Composition*.

This Perfection of *Simplicity* is admitted by all Christians in the general; but the thinking Men of each Party would do well to consider, how they can reconcile their particular Schemes, to this uncontested Attribute of the Deity.

COROLL. III. Since God is absolutely perfect, he is the *First Cause* of the Universe.

The consequence is evident, if it be a greater Perfection to be the first than to be a Second Cause. Since there can possibly be but one *First Cause* when any other Being is represented in Scripture, as the Author or Cause of the Universe, He can be but a *Secondary*

a *Secondary* Author or Cause of all Things; whilst the incommunicable Honour of being the first Cause or original Author is reserved to God only.

COROLL. IV. If God be possessed of all the highest possible Perfections, He is the Universal and Supreme Governor.

If God be the Original Author of all reasonable Beings, his Dominion must needs be as extensive as that Existence He communicated to them; that is, it must be Universal, and no one Person can be exempted from his Jurisdiction. Since the divine Government is Universal, every other Being is subject to its Authority; therefore no one can be *Co-ordinate*, or equal, with God, in the Government of the Universe; for such a Being would be an Exception to, and consequently destroy, the Universality of the Divine Sway. Hence God is a *Supreme* as well as *Universal* Ruler; consequently, whatever other Being, spoken of in Scripture as having Authority over the Universe, can be only a *Subordinate* Ruler. Co-ordination being as really incompatible with absolute Supremacy, as Subordination.

B

COROLL.

COROLL. V. All *Inferiority* is inconsistent with strict and proper Godhead.

The Reason is, because every Inferior wants that Perfection, or that Degree of Perfection, which constitutes another his Superior. But God possesses every Perfection in the highest Degree.—Hence whoever shall be proved in any respect *inferior* to another, cannot be allowed to be *God*; because God must needs be superior to *All* in every valuable Qualification.

COROLL. VI. If God's Perfections are the highest possible, both in Kind and Degree; it follows, that the *Honour* we pay him must be the highest possible too. For *Honour* bears proportion to the *intrinsic Excellency* of the Object or Ground of it.

To whomsoever therefore we justly pay inferior Honour, that Person cannot properly be God; for inferior Honour implies inferior Perfections, and inferior Perfections are not the highest possible.

Hitherto the word God has been used in the strict and proper Sense, to denote the *All-perfect Spirit*, the *First Cause*, and *Supreme Governor*. But it must be granted

granted the Scripture uses it sometimes more laxly, and applies it to other Beings on account of somewhat in which they resemble the Divine Being.—So *Angels* are called Gods. *Pf.* xcvi. 7, *Hebr.* i. 6.—and *Magistrates*, *Pf.* lxxxii. 1, 6, 7, *John* x. 34.—and even *Heathen Idols*, *Jer.* x. 11, *1 Cor.* viii. 5.

DEFINITION II.

A Person is an intelligent Agent, or an intelligent active Being, or (according to Dr. *Waterland*) an intelligent Agent, having the distinctive Characters of I, Thou; He.

All Beings that we know of are divided into *Matter* and *Spirit*. *Matter* is allowed to be unintelligent and inactive; it follows therefore that every *Person* is a *Spirit*.

COR. I. Since one Understanding and one Will constitute one Person, three Understandings and three Wills constitute three Persons.

If therefore the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*, shall hereafter be proved to have each of them an Understanding and Will distinct from the other Two, it will

follow that they are three Persons, in the Sense of this Definition.

COR. II. Since every *Spirit* has an Understanding and Will, and since the distinguishing Characteristics of a *Person* are Understanding and Will too ; it follows that every *Spirit* is a *Person*, as we before found that every *Person* is a *Spirit*.

COR. III. If God be a *Spirit*, He is a *Person*.

COR. IV. From the Simplicity of God it follows, that He is but one *Person*.

For if God be three intelligent Agents, as He certainly is, if each divine *Person* be an individual Intelligent Agent, He must be a compounded Being ; unless a *Compositum* of three Persons be as simple as any one of its Constituents, each of which is allowed to be a *Person*, or intelligent Agent.

DEFINITION III.

A Man is a Body, of such a determinate Shape as we commonly call a Human Body, animated by a *Spirit*.

Man is usually defined a *rational Animal* : But it may be much better to define him a *Spirit united to an Animal of such a Shape*, or an *Animal of such a peculiar Shape united to a Spirit*, or a
Being

Being composed of such an Animal and a Mind. Watts's Logic, P. I. ch. 6. §. 6.

COR. I. Since a Man is a Compound of Body and Spirit; and since every Spirit is a Person, it follows, that a Man may be called *a Person*, with respect to his animating Spirit. The Body indeed, being unintelligent and inactive, cannot properly come into the Idea of a *Person*, though it be a Constituent of that Compositum we commonly call a *Man*.

COR. II. Hence should an Angel animate a human Body, he might properly be said to become a Man.—See *Gen. xviii. 2, 22. xix. 1, 10.* compared with *Hebr. xiii. 2.*

COR. III. Hence our blessed Lord was a real *Man*, on supposition of his Body's being animated by the *Logos* (or Word) the immediate Former of all Things, John i. 1.

Propositions, evidently deducible from uncontroverted Principles of Reason, or Revelation, or both, may be taken for granted by a Christian writing for the Use of Christians. Such Propositions therefore, as well as self-evident ones, I include in the Term AXIOMS.

A X I O M S.

AXIOM I. There is but one God.

This is the united Voice of *Reason* and of *Revelation*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6.

COR. I. If there be but one God, there is but one self-existent Being; consequently every other Being derives all it is and has from God.

COR. II. All Derivation of Existence is inconsistent with Godhead. For God alone is self-existent; consequently no derived Person can be God; because he cannot be both derived and underived at once.

Since *Creation* implies Derivation of Existence; it follows that a created Being cannot be God.—Since *Generation* implies Derivation of Existence; a begotten Being cannot be God.

COR. III. Every Perfection of a derived Being must be derived as well as its Existence. For without doubt the Attributes are derivative in the same Sense, as the Essence is. I add, every derived Perfection, or Attribute, argues a derivation of Existence; for derived Attributes infer a derivative Person, just as underived ones imply a self-existent one. If then I prove,
with

with respect to any particular Person, that any one of his *Powers* are derived, I may safely conclude him to be a derivative Being; and by consequence all the rest of his Powers to be derived too.

COR. IV. The Divine Supremacy follows from the *Unity*, as well as from the *absolute Perfections* of the Deity.

For suppose two Co-ordinate Supreme Governors, by *Def* I. *Cor.* IV. They must be two Gods, and yet by *Ax.* I. there is but one God; consequently one of the *supposed Co-ordinates* must be not Co-ordinate, but Subordinate.

AXIOM II. The one God, properly speaking, is either, All three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, taken together; or One only of those Persons singly considered.—Or, in other Words, The one God is Father, *and* Son, *and* Holy Spirit; or else, The one God is Father, *or* Son, *or* Holy Spirit.

AXIOM III. The Scripture explained by itself and by right Reason, is the only Standard or Rule of Faith in Matters of pure Revelation.

God in giving Revelation supposes Men to have the Use of their Reason,

and requires them to exercise it in explaining the sacred Writings, as well as in proving their Divine Authority.—It is Reason the Apostle appeals to, 1 *Cor.* x. 15. *Judge ye what I say* — But then Reason is not the only help we are favoured with in finding out the Sense of Revelation, for *Scripture* must be compared with, and often explained by itself; and to this Test must every Proposition be brought, which contains a Matter confessedly of pure Revelation.

—The *Beræans* are applauded by the Apostle, as Persons of a Generosity of Spirit superior to their Neighbours of *Thessalonica*, for thus bringing his own Discourses to the Test of Sacred Writ.

Acts xvii. 11.—In explaining a particular Text, regard must be had, both to the Subject or Person spoken of, and also to the Context, and the whole of Scripture, so that nothing ought to be predicated of any Person inconsistent with the rest of his Character; or one Text must not be made to contradict many.—A humble Christian will come to his Bible with the Temper of a Learner, to inform his Judgment, and will not bring his Hypo-
thesis

thesis with him to interpret Scripture by; for by so doing, instead of making the sacred Writings the Rule of his Faith, he makes his own pre-conceived Notions the Rule of explaining them. This is running directly counter to God's gracious Design in favouring us with that blessed Book, which is to inform our Judgments, and mend our Hearts, but not to strengthen our Prepossessions.

AXIOM IV. When the Signification or Denotation of a Word or Phrase is determined in any particular Text, we ought to keep to that Signification or Denotation, unless forced, by the nature of the Subject, or Context, to another.

Thus Knowledge denotes Personality in some Cases, therefore it must be allowed to do so in others, unless a manifest Reason to the contrary evidently appears, as, *Job* vii. 10. *Psa.* ciii. 16. *Mat.* vi. 3.

The *Pronouns*, I, Thou, Me, My, &c. express or imply *one Person*; therefore We, Ye, They, Our, Your, imply *more Persons*, *John* xiv. 23, 27. xvii. 21. *Rom.* x. 12, For the *same Person* is Lord of all, being rich, &c.

AXIOM V. An individual Perfection cannot be predicated of two distinct Persons, though they may each of them possess a Perfection of the same Name, for Instance, WISDOM.

Suppose *A* and *B* two distinct Persons; one of them *A* is underived, the other *B* derived: The individual Wisdom of *A* cannot be predicated of *B*; because *A*'s Wisdom is underived, but *B*'s derived, by Def. I. Cor. I. and Ax. I. Cor. III. Now if *A* and *B* be both of them possessed of the same individual Wisdom, it must be at once both *derived* and *underived*, which is absurd to assert of the same individual Perfection. — Again, Suppose *A* and *B* both derived Persons, I say the Wisdom of *A* is not individually the same with that of *B*: for the Wisdom of *A* may be destroyed, whilst that of *B* may remain in its full Vigor. Now the same Individual cannot be *destroyed* and yet be in full Vigor, that is, *not destroyed*, at one and the same Time.

COR. I. If it be proved that *A* and *B* have a Perfection or Power of the same Name, e. g. WISDOM, but that of *A* is underived, and that of *B* is derived; and
for

For the same Reason if that of *A* be greater in Degree, and that of *B* be less; we may conclude, it is only the same *specific* Perfection, which admits of different Prædicates and Degrees; and from thence argue them *distinct* Persons.

COR. II. If *A* and *B* be *distinct* Persons, they can never have the same *Numerical* Perfections; though they may possess the same *Specific* Ones.

AXIOM VI. When a Perfection of the same Name, *e. g.* HOLINESS, is appropriated to *A* in one Text, and ascribed to *B* in another; *A* must not be understood to possess it exclusive of *B*; but only Independently, or in a peculiarly high Degree; or else the Word is used in two Senses.

Thus *God* is said to be *only Holy*, Rev. xv. 4; yet a *Bishop* should be *Holy*, Tit. i. 8.—So, though *God* be the *only Master*, Jude ver. 4. yet human *Servants* have their *Masters*, 1 Tim. vi. 1.—By the same Method we may account for an *Action* appropriated to *One*, which in another Place is permitted or enjoined to *Another*.—So, though *Service* be ap-
pro-

propriated to *God*, Mat. iv. 10. 1 Sam. viii. 3; yet it is *allowed*, nay it is due to *Men*, Ex. xxi. 2, 6. Lev. xxv. 39, 40; though forbid to *Heathen Deities*, Deut. v. 9. xxviii. 14.

AXIOM VII. An Action is said to be performed by two Persons, when the one does it by the Influence of, or by Ability, or Commission received from the other.

Thus we say, Sir *Christopher Wren* built *St. Paul's*, though the Under-Workmen laid the Materials together; that is, built it. It is enough that they, each of them, contributed their respective Part to raise that noble Pile of Building. So *David* made him Houses, 1 Chr. xv. 1. and *Solomon* made a Throne, 1 Kings x. 18. which they ordered others to do. When *Joseph* is said to be the Doer of whatsoever the rest of the Prisoners did, Gen. xxxix. 22, that Expression can only respect the Influence he had over his Fellow-Prisoners.

AXIOM VIII. Every Spirit that animate a finite Body, must itself also be finite or circumscribed.

COR.

COR. I. Since every Man is made up of two finite Parts, Body and Soul, no Man can be *God*, because he cannot be finite and infinite at once.

COR. II. Since what was once infinite or omnipresent, cannot become finite or confined to any Part or Space, and therefore cannot animate a Human Body, it is impossible for *God* to become a *Man*.

The judicious Reader will apprehend the Difference between *animating* a Mass of Matter, and *acting upon* it. My Soul may act upon a Ball, *e. g.* by putting it into Motion, stopping its Motion, &c. which yet it does not animate, as it does its own proper Body.

PROPOSITION I.

Jesus Christ was a real Man.

THIS is evident from the Testimony (1) of Himself, *Job. viii. 40. Ye seek to kill me, a Man, who have told you the Truth.* (2) of John the Baptist, *John*

John i. 30. This is He of whom I said, after me cometh a Man who is preferred before me. (3) of the Officers, John vii. 46. Never Man spake like this Man. (4) of the blind Man, John ix. 11. A Man, that is called Jesus made clay, &c. (5) of the incensed Jews, John x. 33. Because that thou, being a Man, makest thyself a God. (6) of the Damsel, John xviii. 17. Art not thou also one of this Man's Disciples. (7) of Peter, Mat. xxvi. 72. I do not know the Man. (8) of Pilate, Luke xxiii. 6. Pilate—asked whether the Man were a Galilean. (9) of Paul, Acts xvii. 31. He (i. e. God) hath appointed a Day in which he will judge the World in righteousness by that Man [i. e. Jesus Christ] whom he hath ordained, &c.—Rom. v. 15. Much more the Grace of God, and the Gift of Grace, which is by one Man, Jesus Christ, &c.—1. Tim. ii. 5. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.—He was indeed a Man, pointed out, as it were, by God to the Jews, by the Miracles, Prodigies and Signs, which God did by Him among them, Acts ii. 22.

COR.

COR. If Christ was a *real Man*, He had a finite Body, and consequently a finite Soul. See *Ax. VIII.*

Hence the WORD, on supposition of its animating our Saviour's human Body, must needs be finite. *Mat. xxvi. 11. Ye have the Poor always with you, but ye have not Me always. John xvii. 11. And I am no more in the World,* When our Lord's Body was absent, the WORD was absent too. *Mat. xviii. 20. xxviii. 20. speak not of our blessed Lord's personal Presence.*—If then our Saviour's Body, and its animating Spirit be each of them finite, he can by no Means be *omnipresent*, because two Finites, can never constitute one Infinite.

PROPOSITION II.

Jesus Christ is a Person.

OUR Lord was a *Man*. Prop. I. and therefore a *Person*, Cor. I. Def. III.

But to be more particular; it will appear by Scripture-Evidence, that our Saviour had the distinguishing Characteristics of a Person.

I. His

I. His *Understanding* or *Intelligence* may be argued from.

1. His **KNOWLEDGE**. He knew *all Men, and what was in Man*, John ii. 24, 25. He knew the *Thoughts of Men*, Mat. ix. 4. xii. 25. Luke vi. 8. ix. 47. John vi. 61. xi. 17. He knew *that the Father had given all Things into his Hands*, John xiii. 3. He knew *the Father*, John x. 15. Mat. xi. 27. Nor does any one know the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.

Foreknowledge is ascribed to Him, John vi. 64. For Jesus knew from the Beginning, who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.—xviii. 4. Jesus therefore knowing all Things that should come upon him.—Nay Omniscience, John xxi. 17. Lord, thou knowest all Things.—When we read of Knowledge in others (Mat. xxviii. 5. Mark i. 24.—John xvii. 7.) we look on it as a Mark of Personality: so by Ax. IV. should we when it is ascribed to Jesus Christ.

2. His **WISDOM**. This was surprising to those he taught, Mat. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 2. He was filled with *Wisdom*, Luke ii. 40. He is stiled the
Wisdom

Wisdom of God, 1 Cor. i. 24. Nay in him are hid all the Treasures of *Wisdom and Knowledge*, Col. ii. 3.

3. The *Authority* with which he spake and taught, so as to over-awe his very Enemies and their Emissaries. *Mat. vii. 29.* He taught the People as one having Authority, and not as the Scribes. So, the Officers, sent by the Pharisees and High-Priests, bring word to their Principals, *Never Man spake like this Man*, John vii. 46.

II. His *Will* or Agency may be argued from

1. His own *Confession*. *Mat. viii. 3.* *I will, be thou clean.* John v. 21. *The Son quickeneth whom he will.* xxi. 22. *If I will, that He tarry till I come.* xvii. 24. *Father, as for those whom thou hast given me, I will [or desire] that where I am, &c.* See *Mat. xxvi. 39.* *Mark xiv. 36.* *John v. 30.* vi. 38.

2. The *Testimony* of others.—Of his own Disciples. *If thou wilt let us make here three Tabernacles*, *Mat. xvii. 4.* xxvi. 17. *Luke ix. 54.* *Lord, wilt thou that we command Fire to come down from Heaven?*—Of the Leper, *Mat. viii. 2.*
Lord,

Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.—When we read of a *Will* in others (*Mat. i. 19. xx. 32. xxvii. 17. Mark xv. 15. Luke iv. 6.*) who denies a proper Personality? When we read of a *Choice* in *Moses. Hebr. xi. 25.* of a *Desire* in *St. Paul, Phil. i. 23.* who thinks of any Thing less than somewhat *Personal*? and why not in *Jesus*, when he so earnestly desired to eat the Passover with his Disciples? *Luke xxii. 15.* See *Axiom IV.*

III. He discovered the *Afflictions* of—*Love, e. g. to Lazarus, John xi. 36.* To *John* as is supposed, *John xxi. 20. xx. 2. xiii. 23.* To his *Disciples* in general, *John xv. 9.* To his Father, *John xiv. 31.*—*Sorrow, or Grief, Mat. xxvi. 38. My Soul is exceeding Sorrowful, even unto Death.*—*Anger* mixt with *Grief, Mark iii. 5. And when He had looked round about on them with Anger, being Grieved for the hardness of their Hearts.*

IV. Personal Pronouns are applied to *Jesus Christ, I, Thou, He. Ax. IV.*

V. *Personality* is implied in the Terms, *Saviour, Luke ii. 11. Acts v. 31.*—*Mediator. 1 Tim. ii. 5.*—*Advocate, 1 John ii. 1.*

ii. 1.—*Son*. Our Saviour is the *Son* of God, Luke i. 35. and declared to be so with *Power*, or by a Miracle, Rom. i. 4. He is a *beloved Son*, Mat. iii. 17.—*Son* of the *Living God*, Mat. xvi. 16.—*Son* of the *only true God*, John xvii. 1, 3.—The *only begotten* Son of God, John i. 14. iii. 18.—The First-born or *First-begotten*, Rom. viii. 29.—Hebr. i. 6. There is no real Inconsistency between the Titles of *Only-begotten*, and *First-begotten*.

To conclude, Did not Jesus Christ create all Things, Col. i. 16. and shall He that gave Men and Angels their rational Powers, not be himself a rational Being, or in other Words, a *Person*?

PROPOSITION III.

Jesus Christ is but one Person.

THERE are some very pious Christians, who maintain that our blessed Lord was a *Compound Person*, consisting of the Logos, the Soul, and the Body. But I think, it is evident from Holy Writ, that our Saviour was and is, a Compound of no more than one single intelligent

intelligent Agent or Spirit, and a human Body. For (1) The Scripture no where *asserts* two intelligent Agents in Christ Jesus. If it does, let the Text or Texts be produced, and a due Submission shall be paid. (2.) Nor doth it *suppose* such a thing, by laying down what implies it. For the intelligent Agent is sufficient to account for every Thing said of the blessed Jesus, either before the Creation, before his Incarnation, during his Abode on Earth, or after his Ascension, even to his second Coming.

Our Lord, without doubt, existed before his Birth of the Virgin Mary.—He was before *John the Baptist*, John i. 15. *He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me.*

He was before *Abraham*, John viii, 58. *Before Abraham was, I am* [or was] He was before the *Creation*. For all Things were made by Him, *John i. 3.* By Him God made the Worlds, *Hebr. i. 2.* By Him were all Things created, that are in Heaven, &c. *Col. i. 16, 17.*

In this prior State of his, He had Glory with the Father, which he prays to be restored unto after his Exit out of

of this World, *John* xvii. 5.—Again, the same Jesus, who for our Sakes appeared in so poor and mean a Condition, had been, in a prior State of his Existence, *Rich. 2 Cor.* viii. 9.—Again, the same Jesus, who had been *before* in the *Form of a God*, *Phil.* ii. 6, 7. *i. e.* had appeared in the Guise and Character of a God, as personating Deity, and speaking in the First Person; afterward, when He tabernacled among Men, appeared in the *Form of a Servant*, viz. of God, professing himself to be commissioned by the Father, and speaking not of Himself, but as the Father directed him to speak, *John* xii. 49.—But let us trace our blessed Saviour through the several States of his Existence, and see whether the Scripture gives the least hint of any more than one intelligent Agent in the Person called Jesus.

1. We learn from *John* i. 14. that the WORD became Flesh, that it became a Man. For so the word *σὰρξ* signifies in the New Testament, *Mat.* xxiv. 22. *Luke* iii. 6. *John* xvii. 2. *Acts* ii. 17, &c. The same Person that had formerly gone under the Denomination of

of the *Logos* or **WORD** ; afterwards went under that of a *Man*. Now the **WORD** became a *Man* by animating that Body, which God had prepared for him, *Hebr.* x. 5. or in other Words, by partaking of Flesh and Blood, *Heb.* ii. 14. or again, by coming in the Flesh, 1 *John* iv. 2, 3. If the **WORD** by assuming a human Body became a *real Man*, *Def.* III. *Cor.* III. and was hereby qualified for the discharge of whatever the Father had appointed him to do in the Capacity of the Saviour of the World, what need we suppose another Spirit, called a human Soul, of which the Scripture is wholly silent? Called, I say, a *human Soul*, by which really nothing ought to be meant, but a *Spirit animating a human Body*.—To conclude this Head, The same *Jesus* that dwelt among us, *came down from Heaven*, *John* iii. 13. This Descent from Heaven cannot respect the *Body*, which was of an earthly Extract, being born of the Virgin ; and since the Scripture never speaks of two Spirits, which together animated the human Body of *Jesus*, it must be understood of the **WORD**.

2. It is certain from the Gospel-History, that the same Person, that was born of the Virgin, after a Life of Subjection and Sufferings, died at *Jerusalem*. So that the WORD was the very Spirit which Jesus gave up, *John* xix. 30. having recommended it to his Father, *Luke* xxiii. 46.

3. The same Person that died, rose again, and ascended up into Heaven.— He was known after his Resurrection by his Disciples, *John* xx. 20, 25, 28. and ascended in view of several of his Followers, *Acts* i. 3, 9, 10, 11. And whether did he ascend, but to the Place where he had been before, *John* vi. 62? The same Person that descended, afterwards ascended far above all Heavens, *Eph.* iv. 10.

4. The same Person that ascended, was exalted to the right Hand of God, *Acts* ii. 33. v. 31. *Rom.* viii. 34. There, where He was placed by God himself, *Eph.* i. 20. is he represented *sitting*, *Col.* iii. 1. there, was he seen *standing*, *Acts* vii. 55.

5. The same Person remains in Heaven for a determinate Season, *Acts* iii. 21. at
the

the End of which he shall return, *Acts* i. 11. without a Sin-offering, *Heb.* ix. 28. agreeably to the Expectation of his faithful People, *Phil.* iii. 20. 1 *Thes.* i. 10. 2 *Tim.* iv. 8. *Tit.* ii. 13.—So that the Creator of the World became a real Man, lived on Earth, died, rose again, ascended into Heaven, and shall return to Judgment.

Thus the Scripture represents our blessed Saviour as constituted of a Body and one Spirit, that is, as *one Person*.

Qu. Whether those, that suppose Jesus Christ to consist of the WORD, the human Soul, and the Body, do not in reality make him *two Persons*, whilst in Words they call him *One*? For is not the WORD one Person, and is not the human Soul another?

COR. I. Hence it appears that our Lord was a real Man, constituted of a human Body animated by the WORD. Now I have *proved* what before was only *supposed*, *Def. III. Cor. III.*

COR. II. If Christ Jesus be but *one Person*, then whatever is asserted of him in Scripture must be so explained as to agree with his Character as *Man*; other-
wise

wise we shall make Scripture inconsistent with itself, contrary to *Ax. III.*

PROPOSITION IV.

The Holy Spirit is a Person.

THE Personality of the Holy Spirit is evident from

I. His *Understanding* or Knowledge, *1 Cor. ii. 11. No one knoweth the Things of God, except the Spirit of God.* The Apostle in the former Part of the Verse, had compared the Spirit of God to that Spirit, which being in Man, doth search and discern his inward Counsels and Purposes, but the Spirit of *Man*, says Dr. Barrow, is a substantial Thing; wherefore it is intimated, says he, that correspondently the Spirit of God is such a Being.

II. His *Will*, *1 Cor. xii. 11. But all these Things that one and the self-same Spirit effecteth, dividing to every one severally as He wills.*

III. The Ascription of such Things to him, as imply Personality; for Actions

C

certainly

certainly imply Agents, and rational Actions infer rational Agents.

1. His *Calling* and *Sending* some Persons in distinction from others, imply Will and Choice, *Acts* xiii. 2. *The Holy Spirit said, seperate me Barnabas and Saul, for the Works to which I have called them, &c.* To which I add His *forbidding* the Disciples to preach the Word in *Asia*, *Acts* xvi. 6.

2. His *teaching* the Disciples, and *bringing* important Facts and Doctrines to their remembrance, *John* xiv. 26. *He shall teach you all Things, and bring all Things to your remembrance, which I have said unto you.*

3. His *conducting* and *guiding* them into Truth and in the Course of the Christian Life. *John* xvi. 13. *When He the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth.* *Rom.* viii. 14. *For as many as are led [or conducted] by the Spirit of God, They are the Sons of God.*

4. His *witnessing* to Christ, *John* xv. 26. and with the Spirit of the Saints, *Rom.* viii. 16.

5. His *officiating* as Comforter or Advocate, *John* xiv. 16, 26. *I will pray the Father*

Father and He will send you another Advocate——But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit——he shall teach you all Things.

6. He is said to *speake and hear*: to *speake* what he hears, *John* xvi. 13. To *speake* in the Saints, *Mat.* x. 20. I suppose by teaching them what they were to say, *Luke* xii. 12. See *Acts* x. 19.—xiii. 2.

7. He may be *grieved and vexed*, *If.* lxiii. 10. *Eph.* iv. 30.—If *Love of the Spirit*, *Rom.* xv. 30. doth not mean Love to the Spirit, the *Passion of Love* is ascribed to him. As also,

8. The *Exercise of Power*, *Rom.* xv. 19. *Through mighty Signs and Wonders by the Power of the Spirit of God.*

IV. *Personal Pronouns* made use of in speaking of Him, denote a proper Personality.

Not *it*, but *He* is the Article commonly assigned to the Spirit; and that with Marks of doing it studiously. *John* xvi. 13. *When he* (in the Masculin Gender) *comes, the Spirit of Truth* (in the Neuter) &c. See *John* xiv. 26.—xv. 26.—*John* xvi. 7. *The Comforter will not come, but*

if I depart I will send Him unto you. 1 Cor. ii. 11. — None (in the Masculine Gender again) *knoweth the Things of God, but the Spirit of God*, why, otherwise besides Analogy of Grammar, should the Stile be so tempered or inflected, but to insinuate the Holy Spirit's Personality?

V. Surely He, who is often emphatically stiled the *Spirit*, must be esteemed a *Spirit*, or Person.—See *Mat.* iv. 1. *Mark* i. 10. *Acts* viii. 29. xvi. 7. 1 *Cor.* ii. 10.—Perhaps several of the Texts I have brought in proof of the *Personality* of the Spirit, may be referred, by some of my Readers, to His *extraordinary Gifts*; those Texts to be sure must be taken off from the Evidence by such Readers, who must impartially weigh the remaining Proof.

PROPOSITION V.

The Father of Jesus Christ is a Person.

THIS Proposition I apprehend to be of the last Importance, for on the Truth of it depends all Religion. If the Father be not a Person, or intelligent Being,

Being, He never exhibited any Revelation, nor exercises any Providence, He is no Lawgiver, and we are not accountable to him for our Conduct, nor in Danger of any Punishment for our Misbehaviour.

The *Personality* of the Father is evident from the following Considerations.

I. The two distinguishing Characteristics of a Person, *viz.* *Understanding* and *Will* are ascribed in Scripture to the Father.

1. *Understanding* or Knowledge.

John x. 15. *As the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father.* Luke x. 22. *No one knoweth who the Son is, but the Father.* Here is Knowledge appropriated.— Nay the *Foreknowledge* of an Event remarkable for its Importance, *viz.* the *Future Judgment* is appropriated to Him, Mat. xxiv. 36. *But of that Day and Hour knoweth no one, no not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* Even to the express Exclusion of the Son from a Participation of that Knowledge. See Mark xiii. 32. *But of that Day and Hour knoweth no one; neither the Angels that are in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father.*— But farther, the Father is *Wise*.

Now

Now Wisdom is Knowledge in an advanced Degree, *Rom. xi. 33. O the depth of the Riches both of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God? How unsearchable are his Judgments, and untraceable his Ways! His Wisdom is manifold or multiform, Eph. iii. 10.* Nay, the Father is the *only wise God. Rom. xvi. 27. Only Wise*, as being the Fountain of Wisdom to every other Being, even of those *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge which are hid in Christ Jesus. Col. ii. 3.*—The Father will be hereafter proved, independently of this Paragraph, to be the God spoken of above.—To conclude this Head, The Father is said to have *taught* his Son Jesus, *John viii. 28.* Now could He communicate Knowledge to so knowing a Being as our blessed Lord, who had none? Or could that which was not a Person have any Knowledge?

2. *Will* is ascribed to the Father.

Mat. vi. 10. Thy Will be done; namely, the Will of the Christian's Father, who is also Christ's, *John xx. 17.*—*Mat. xxvi. 39. O my Father (says Christ) not as I will, but as thou, sc. wilt—ver. 42. Thy will be done.*—*Acts xxii. 14. The God of our*

our Fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know his Will. See also, Eph. i. 3, 11. Heb. ii. 3, 4. — xiii. 20, 21. Rev. iv. 11. By thy Will they exist and were created.

II. The Scripture ascribes to the Father what implies Personality.

1. Sundry Affections, e. g. *Love, and Hatred*, John xiv. 21. *He that loveth me shall be loved by my Father*, See xvii. 23. Rom. ix. 13. *Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated*. These words are quoted from Mal. i. 3. where Jehovah the God of the Jews, and Father of Christ (*John viii. 54*) is introduced speaking, ver. 2. — *Anger and Wrath* are ascribed to God, who shall be afterward proved to be the Father of Christ, *John iii. 36. Rom. ix. 22. Heb. iii. 11—iv.*

3. *Rev. xix. 15. Though Affections* when applied to the Father are not to be understood properly or grossly as they are to be found in Men; that would argue Imperfection, which is infinitely removed from Him; yet since there is no Medium between an intelligent and unintelligent Being, it is easy to see the Scripture designed, by these Ways of speaking

speaking, to represent the Father, as the former, rather than the latter of these.

2. Is not *Personality*, that is, Intelligence and Agency implied in the Terms *Father and God*? John xx. 17. *My Father and your Father, my God and your God.* Mat. xxii. 32. *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* (Acts iii. 13) *God is not the God of the Dead but of the Living.* Now as the Father of Jesus Christ is a *God of the living*; so He must needs be a living, intelligent, active God. For to be a *God* to any Persons, is to employ intelligent active Powers for their Benefit, which can only be done by a Person.

3. Does not Authority Regal and Legislative, and the being the Fountain thereof to others, imply Personality? Is. xxxiii. 22. *Jehovah is our Judge, Jehovah is our Lawgiver, Jehovah is our King.* Forgiveness is ascribed to him, Luke xxiii. 34. *Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.*—Judgment is committed by Him to the Son, John v. 22. *The Father judgeth no one, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son.*—Surely, prescribing Laws to, governing, and passing Judgment on intelligent Beings, must

must imply intelligence and reasoning Powers in Him, of whom these Things are affirmed.

III. The Application of *Personal Pronouns* to the Father, argues his *Personality*.

ΕΧΕΙΡΟΣ, *John* v. 19, 38. vi. 29. viii. 42. ΑΥΤΟΣ, xiv. 10. v. 20. ΑΥΤΟΥ, iii. 17. ΕΑΥΤΟΥ, *Rom.* viii. 3. ΕΑΥΤΩ, *John* v. 26.

IV. The Scripture represents the Father as *a Spirit*. Now a Spirit is a Person (*Def.* II. *Cor.* II.) *John* iv. 24. *God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, &c.* God in this Context refers to the Father of Jesus Christ; because He that is spoken of as the Object of Worship, is the same that was worshipped at *Jerusalem*, ver. 20, 21. viz. the God of the Jews, and the Father of Jesus Christ, *John* viii. 54. *Acts* iii. 13. Therefore to say that *God* is a Spirit, is the same as to say, *the Father* is a Spirit, that is a Person.

We see then, that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have each of them the Characteristicks of a Person ascribed to them in Scripture, as also several Things which suppose or imply Personality; therefore

each of them is a Person. Consequently the Father together with the Son and Holy Spirit are three Persons (*Def. II. Cor. I.*)—But as the Scripture when it speaks of any one of these glorious Persons *singly*, asserts or supposes his Personality ; so when it treats of them together, it asserts or supposes them *Distinct Persons*.

PROPOSITION VI.

Jesus Christ is a distinct Person from the Father.

I. **T**HE distinguishing Characteristics of a Person are not the same, but different in Father and Son ; therefore They are *distinct Persons*.

1. The Father's *Knowledge* is different from the Son's, as being *more extensive*. *Mark xiii. 32.* Our Saviour confesses his Ignorance of the Day of Judgment. And as here the knowledge of the precise Time of that awful Event is denied of the Son, so *Mat. xxiv. 36*, it is appropriated to the *Father only*. Now the same Person could not know, and be ignorant of

of the same Thing at the same Time. The same individual Knowledge could not be *greater* and *less* at the same Instant; consequently the Father's Knowledge was not the same individual Knowledge with the Son's; therefore They were distinct Persons (*Ax. V. Cor. I.*)

Again, I observe that the Knowledge of the Father and Son was *mutual*. Now mutual Knowledge is distinct Knowledge, both the Subject and Object of it being Distinct. And the Knowledge the Son had of the Father could not be distinct from the Knowledge the Father had of the Son, unless They were distinct Persons. *Mat. xi. 27. No one knoweth the Son but the Father; nor does any one know the Father but the Son, and He to whom the Son will reveal Him.*—If the Knowledge, which the Person, to whom Christ revealed the Father, had of Him, evidences His distinct Personality from the Father; then our Saviour's Knowledge of the Father, in like Manner, evidences His distinct Personality, as also does the Father's Knowledge of the Son, whereby the Knowledge becomes mutual.—The mutual Knowledge of Father

and Son is revealed also in *John x. 14, 15. I know my Sheep, and am known by Mine, as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father.* — I do not say the mutual Knowledge of Father and Son is the exact Standard of that between Christ and his Sheep; for Persons and Things may be sufficiently distinct, tho' vastly unequal. Neither do I think the Particle *αὐτός* ever necessarily implies a perfect Equality, but a sensible Likeness and general Similitude between Things compared. Again, The Father and Son's Knowledge is different; because the *Subjects of different Attributes*. The Son's Knowledge was communicated to Him; the Father's uncommunicated or derived, like his own infinite Essence. *John viii. 28. As my Father hath taught me, I speak, &c.* — To conclude this Head, As the Father and Son are distinct *Subjects* of Knowledge, so are they distinct *Objects* of it too. — *John viii. 19. Ye neither know me nor my Father: if ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also.* *John xvi. 3. xiv. 7.*

2. The Scripture ascribes *distinct Wills* to the Father and the Son. *Mat. xxvi.*

39. *Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou, sc. wilt.* — John v. 30. *I seek not my own Will, but the Will of the Father who sent me.* — Did our Lord subject his own Will to his own Will? Can the same Spirit have a Will and a Will, the one subjected to the other? Here is an evident Preference of one Will to another, which can only take place in distinct Wills; and distinct Wills prove distinct Persons.

II. Father and Son are both Subjects and Objects of the distinct Affections of *Love* and *Hatred*.

They are distinct Subjects of *Love*, John xiv. 21. *He that loveth me shall be loved by my Father, and I will love Him.* Observe, as Christ is the Object of the Christian's Love, and therefore a distinct Person from Him, so the Christian is the Object of the distinct Love of Father and Son, and therefore distinct from them both; and consequently They are distinct from one another. — But farther, the Love of the Father and Son to each other is *mutual*; consequently they were distinct Objects and Subjects of Affection, and therefore they were distinct Persons.

John

John xiv. 31. *That the World may know that I love the Father.* iii. 35, *The Father loveth the Son*, even to such an intense Degree, that his Love to the Son is represented as it were the Standard of his Love to the Saints. John xvii. 23. *That thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me*, and ver. 26. *that the Love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them.*—But further, Father and Son are distinct Objects of Hatred, and therefore distinct Persons. John xv. 23, 24. *He that hateth me, hateth the Father also.*—Again, They are distinct Subjects of hatred, Deut. xvi. 22. *Image, which Jehovah thy God hateth.* Mal. i. 3. Rom. ix. 13. Rev. ii. 6. *Thou hatest the Deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate.*—They are represented as distinct Objects of Faith. John xii. 44. *He that believeth in me, believeth not in me* [i. e. only] *but in Him that sent me.* xiv. 1. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me, or, ye believe also in me.*—Do not Father and Son seem as distinct Objects of Faith as Christ and Moses? John v. 46. *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for*

for *He wrote of me.*—As our blessed Lord is sometimes spoken of as a distinct Object of Faith from the Father; so He is represented as a *Medium* of Faith in the Father, which as fully proves his distinct Personality as the other. 1 Pet. i. 21. *You, who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the Dead.*—Again, They are distinct Objects of Reception, Denial and Contempt. Mark ix. 37. *Whosoever shall receive one of such Children in my Name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me; but Him that sent me.*—As the Children spoken of are distinct from Christ; so He is distinct from his Father. 1 John ii. 22. *He is the Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.* Luke x. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me.* Observe how our Saviour is spoken of, being as distinct from the Father, as the Disciples were from him.

III. The distinct Personality of Father and Son is implied in the *Relation* that subsists between them; in the *Reference* of the Son to the Father as His Image;
and

and in the important *Transactions* in which they were both concerned;

1. The *Relation* that subsisted between them, was that of *Father* and *Son*, which evidently implies distinct Personality.

2. Our blessed Lord is referred to the Father as his *Image*, and hence arises a fresh Argument for their distinct Personality. Col. i. 15. *Who* (i. e. Christ Jesus) *is the Image of the invisible God.*

The Invisibilty of the Father is declared in Scripture, *John* i. 18. *1 Tim.* vi. 16. If the Father be always *invisible*, but the Son has been sometimes *visible*, it follows that They are distinct Persons.

3. The Important *Transactions* of the Son with the Father, manifest their distinct Personality. To this Head may be referred,

First, His *Mediation* or *Advocateship*.

1 Tim. ii. 5. *For there is one God and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* *1 John* ii. 1. *If any one sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Righteous.* Surely the Mediator between God and Men must be as distinct from Him, with whom he mediates, as from Them, for whom

whom he mediates. When our Lord puts up a Prayer to his heavenly Father, *John xvii.* does He pray to himself or another? When He says, he would pray the Father to send his Disciples *another Advocate*, *John xiv. 16.* whom does He apply to, Himself or Another? Surely He that prays must be a distinct Person from Him, to whom the Prayer is addressed.

Secondly. His joint Agency with the Father in the Creation. God created all Things by Jesus Christ. *Eph. iii. 9.* *Hebr. i. 2.* Now if Creative Powers imply *Intelligence*, *Prop. II* (and who could give Understanding to others that is destitute of it himself?) The different Part our blessed Lord sustained in the Creation from what his Father did, proves his *distinct* Personality.

IV. Father and Son have a *distinct Propriety*, in what they are represented as having in common. *John xvi. 15.* *All Things that the Father hath are mine*, *xvii. 10.* *All mine are thine, and thine are mine.* When the Prodigal's Father says to him, *Luke xv. 31,* *Son, all that I have is thine*; He does not insinuate an equal *Property* in both Persons; but he implies that

that both were *equally*, consequently *distinct* Persons. So would I argue from our Saviour's Expressions, a distinct property, and therefore a distinct Personality.

V. Our Saviour's Doctrine was not his own, but his Father's ; therefore they were distinct Persons. John vii. 16. *My Doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me*, viz. the Father's, as appears from *John* xiv. 24.

Now if Christ was not a *distinct* Person from the Father, He was the *same* Person, and then the Doctrine of the Father must be the Doctrine of the Son, contrary to our Lord's express Words. Our Saviour did not speak of *Himself*, but what his Father gave him in *Commission* to say, *John* xii. 49. He was the *Medium* of conveying those divine Instructions, which the Father, out of his overflowing Goodness, thought proper to favour Mankind with.

VI. The Son became Incarnate, the Father never animated a Human Body ; therefore they are distinct Persons.

The Father never was seen, nor could be seen, therefore He could not be Incarnate.—The Son's Incarnation has been sufficiently

sufficiently proved. *Prop. III. John i. 14, &c.*

VII. Jesus Christ was *with* the Father, and therefore a distinct Person from Him.

John i. 1. *The WORD was with God.* Our blessed Lord after his Incarnation, did not apprehend himself to be *alone*, (though deserted by his Disciples) while his Father was *with him*. John xvi. 32. *And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.*

VIII. The Testimony of the Father to the Son was distinct from the Testimony our Lord bore to Himself; therefore they were *distinct Persons*.

See *John v. 31.* Had our Saviour *only* bore witness to Himself, his Witness had not been *true* or credible; but He had the Witness of *Another*, viz. of *John*, which was *true* or worthy of Credit, ver. 32. Nay, He had still greater Witness, than that of *John*; for his *Father* bore witness of Him, ver. 37. — Now if *John* was a Witness, ver. 32. and the *Father* was a distinct Witness from *John*, because a greater, ver. 36, 37. and both of them creditable Witnesses; it follows, the Testimony of the Father was as distinct from

from that of the Son. (whose Testimony to Himself, in his own Cause, ver. 31. had not been creditable or *true*,) as the Testimony of *John* was: Therefore the *Father* was as distinct a Person from the Son as *John* was.—Again, our Lord says, He was not *single* or alone in his Testimony or Judgment; but He and his Father, *John* viii. 16. And He shews, that as the Jewish Law allowed of the joint Testimony of two Persons as *true* or worthy of Credit in their Judicatories, ver. 17. so here were *two*; for He bore witness to Himself (and his Witness was *true*, ver. 14) and besides, the Father bore witness of him, ver. 18.—However difficult it may be to evince the Justness of our Saviour's reasoning from the Law of *Moses*, which required at least two Witnesses *distinct* from the Party concerned, *Deut.* xvii. 6, 7. yet the Use I make of *John* viii. 18. is certainly fair, which is to prove that in our Lord's Judgment his Father and He were *two* Witnesses, and consequently *two distinct Persons*.

IX. I might argue a distinct Personality from the *Personal Pronouns* and *Plural Number*

Number, when used in speaking of the Father and Son.

John xiv. 23. *If any one love me, my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make an abode with him.*

John xvii. 11, 21, 26. This Argument is founded on *Ax. IV.* To conclude this Proposition, The Texts and Reasonings prove that our Lord's *Inferiority* to the Father, *Prop. VIII.* will also as strongly evince his distinct Personality; for *Inferiority* cannot subsist, but between distinct Persons, any more than *Equality*. For the Reader's Satisfaction I shall produce one Example, by which my Meaning will fully appear. Our Saviour's *Mission* will be produced as an Evidence of his Inferiority to the Father; and the same *Mission* is as full a Proof of his distinct Personality as of his Inferiority.

COR. I. Since Christ Jesus is proved to be a distinct Person from the Father; whatever is a distinguishing Characteristic of the Latter, cannot properly belong to the Former. John xvii. 3. Our Saviour styles his Father, the *Only true God*, in contradistinction to Himself, who, as he says, was sent by the only true God.

COR.

COR. II. When any Perfection ascribed, or even appropriated, to the *Father*, is in other Places of Scripture ascribed to the *Son*; we must not understand the Former as possessing it *exclusively* of the Latter, but only independently, or in a peculiarly high Degree, or else the *Word* is used in two Senses. See *Ax. VI.* How otherwise can the Scripture be explained in a consistency with itself. *Ax. III.*

In common Cases, *exclusive Terms* leave room for no *Exceptions*; especially in serious and thoughtful Writers, such as the sacred Ones doubtless are.

PROPOSITION VII.

The Holy Spirit is a distinct Person from the Father and the Son.

I Endeavoured to prove the *Personality* of the Holy Spirit, *Prop. IV.* Now I am to make out His *distinct Personality* both from the Father and the Son.

I. The Holy Spirit is a distinct Person from the Father. For, 1. He is called the *Spirit of the Father* of our Lord

Lord Jesus Christ. Eph. iii. 14, 16. *I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—by his Spirit*, Rom. viii.

11. *But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the Dead, viz. of the Father, (Acts iii. 13, 15.) dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the Dead shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.* So again, ver.

14. *Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God. Who would not take the Spirit of God, to be as distinct from God, viz. the Father, whose Spirit he is; as the Sons of God are distinct from God, whose Sons They are?—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit—So the Things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God.—If the Spirit was the Medium of conveying the Revelation, He must be distinct from Him, who made Use of him as such.*

2. *The Spirit was sent by the Father, and therefore is a distinct Person from Him.—John xiv. 16. The Holy Spirit whom the Father will send, &c. Gal. iv. 6. 1 Cor. ii. 22. We have received the Spirit who is of God.*

This

3. This same Spirit is represented as our *Advocate*, interceding for us, *Rom. viii. 26, 27.* sent by God into our Hearts, crying, *Abba, Father, Gal. iv. 6.* Now no one is properly said to intercede with Himself, but with another. If then the Spirit be a *distinct Person* from the Father, He is *another Spirit, Def. II. Cor. II.* for surely no one will suppose Him *Part* of the Father.

II. The Holy Spirit is a distinct Person from the Son.

1. The Holy Spirit is *sent* by the Son. *John xvi. 7, If I depart I will send him [the Spirit] unto you. Luke xxiv. 49.* From this *Mission* of the Spirit by our blessed Lord, I suppose He is called the *Spirit of Christ*, as before of God, or the Father. *Rom. viii. 9. Now if any one have not the Spirit of Christ, He is none of his. Phil. i. 19. Through your Prayer, and the Supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. i. 11. What Manner of Time the Spirit of Christ, that was in them, did signify. Gal. iv. 6.*

2. The Holy Spirit *receives* Knowledge from Christ, and *communicates* it to his Disciples

Disciples, and *Glorifies Christ*. John xvi. 13, 14. *When He the Spirit of Truth is come—He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak—He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you.* Without all doubt, if the Spirit had not a distinct Understanding of his own, He could not *hear* or learn from another; and when He did *speak* from another, would necessarily speak from Himself too, which is absurd.

3. The Holy Spirit is expressly distinguished from Christ, as being *Another Person*. John xiv. 16. *I will pray the Father and He will send you another Advocate.* If intellectual and active Powers were necessary to qualify Christ Jesus for being an Advocate, 1 John ii. 1. He who is *another Advocate* must also be possessed of the *like*: Therefore He must be a distinct Person.

4. The Holy Spirit *bears testimony* to Christ, and therefore is a distinct Person from him. John xv. 26. *He, the Spirit of Truth, shall testify of me.* As the Father's Testimony to the Son proved Him a distinct Person from the Son, Prop. VI.

so the Spirit's Testimony to the same Person, proves Him also as distinct.

III. The Holy Spirit is distinguished both from the Father and Son in the same Context.

1. In the *Institution of Baptism*. Mat. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore and disciple all Nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*

2. In the *Scripture Doxologies*. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen.*

3. In the Method of our Access to the Father. Eph. ii. 18. *For thro' him, sc. Christ, we both have an access, by one Spirit, to the Father.* If 1 John v. 7. be genuine, the Spirit is expressly distinguished from both Father and Son, as a distinct Witness, and therefore as a distinct Person.* Consider Job. xv. 26.

When

* It has been observed, that the Ancients in their Controversies with the *Arians*, do not quote this Text. *Austin's* labouring so hard to prove his Point from ver. 8th, shews that he was unacquainted

When the Advocate is come whom I will send unto you from the Father. 1 Cor. vi. 11. But ye are justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

Thus I have endeavoured to prove from Scripture, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are *three distinct Persons*, or Spirits, inasmuch as each of them is, throughout that Book, spoken of as having an Understanding and Will, &c. distinct from the other Two; and such things are affirmed of each of them, as cannot, with any Propriety, be asserted of the other Two.

Now these three Spirits must either be Equal or Unequal. If they are *absolutely equal*, and any one of them be hereafter proved to be *God*, according to *Def. I.* there must be three Gods, contrary to *Ax. I.* If they are *Unequal*, we must find out in what respect Any

quainted with ver. 7th, which Verse would happily have saved him much needless Pains, and weak Reasoning. Mr. *Emlyn* says; (Reply to Mr. *Martin*, p. 145.) *I think I might justly say, there is no Evidence of one ancient Greek MS. yet known in the World, which warrants this Text.*

one of them is superior to the Others, and to which particular Person this Superiority is applicable.—Now a Person may be said to be *Inferior* to Another,

1. In respect of his *Original* or *Extract*. Thus if any one derives his Existence from the Will and Power of another, whether by Creation, Generation, or any other Way, He is inferior to that Person in respect of his Original. For surely 'tis more honourable to Beget than to be Begotten, to Create than to be Created, &c.

2. In respect of his *Personal Endowments* and Mental Powers. Thus if a Person receive Knowledge from another, or is less knowing than that other, He is inferior to him in respect of the Derivation or Degree of his mental Powers. Our Savior has determined it to be *more blessed to give than to receive*, Acts xx. 35. And is it not more excellent to possess any higher Perfection or Qualification, either in Kind or Degree, than a lower? To possess, Ex. Gr. Absolute Omniscience than a finite Knowledge, even in the most exalted degree? To possess any valuable Qualification independently on another,

another, than by Derivation from Him, as a Grant by Favour.

3. In respect of his *External Circumstances* and *Relative Capacities*. Thus if a Person *receive* from another a *Commission* to execute Authority and Dominion over others; or is sent, and employed in any Business, however important, by another; He is inferior to that other Person, as acting in an inferior Capacity, and standing in the Relation of a Deputy, an Under-Agent, or Servant to Him. For surely it is more grand to issue out a Commission, than to act under one: To have *every one* act according to our own Will in all things, than to act according to the Will of *any one* in every thing. Surely it is more honourable to send, than to be sent. *The Servant is not greater than his Master, nor he that is sent, greater than he that sent him.* John xiii. 16. that is, he is inferior to the Sender.

PROPOSITION VIII.

Jesus Christ is inferior to the Father.

I. **I**N respect of his *Original*, as a Son to a Father.

The *Sonship* of Christ need not now be proved, it is the united Voice of *Scripture*, Luke i. 35. John viii. 54. Acts iii. 13, 26. 1 John i. 3. (See *Prop. II.*) and of *Antiquity*. Generation implies Derivation of Being and Life. Now tho' some Sons do not, properly speaking, receive their Existence from their Fathers, who are only Instruments or *Ministring Causes* made use of by God to introduce a new Creature into the World; yet Christ is certainly such a Son as receives his Existence from his Father, as a proper *Efficient Cause*.—God may indeed be stiled a *real Father* to all intelligent Beings; for *in Him we live and move and exist*. Acts xvii. 28. Heb. xii. 9. But He is the Father of Christ Jesus in some *peculiarly eminent Sense*, and therefore the Latter is called his only begotten Son, *John* i. 14. and the first born,

born, *Rom. viii. 29.* first begotten, *Heb. i. 6.* and the first born of every Creature, *Col. i. 15.*

Christians indeed are said to be born of God, and to be *of* or *from* God. *John i. 13.* 1 *Job. iii. 9.—iv. 7.—v. 1, 4, 18.* However I am persuaded no sincere Disciple of Jesus Christ will refuse to give Him the Pre-eminence in *Sonship* as well as in every thing else, (*Col. i. 18.*) and own Him as the *First-born* among many Brethren, *Rom. viii. 29.* But Christ is a Son, and as such, inferior to the Father.

II. Jesus Christ is inferior to the Father in respect of the *natural Powers and Endowments* of his Mind, which, however capacious and extensive they are, are spoken of as Inferior to and Dependent on the Father.

1. Our blessed Lord's *Knowledge* was inferior to the Father's, in that it was communicated to him by the Father, and also in that it is Limited, or in a less Degree.—His Knowledge was derived to Him from the Father. The Father's Knowledge is underived; for as the Essence, so are the Attributes.—The Son's

Effence is derived by Generation, and therefore all his Powers and Endowments are derived too. *Ax. I. Cor. III.*

The Son's Knowledge was inferior to the Father's, not only with respect to its *Derivation*, but also in *Degree*; because the Son really knew less than the Father. Our Lord knew not the time of the Day of Judgment, which the Father had an exact Knowledge of. *Mark xiii. 32.* Our Saviour needed a particular Revelation from God to acquaint him with the several Fates and Periods of his own Church. *Rev. i. 1. The Revelation which God gave unto him.*—Jesus increased in Wisdom, *Luke ii. 52.* whereas the Father's Wisdom is confessedly incapable of Increase. And what wonder? For when the *Logos* animated a human Body, it became subject to the Laws of Humanity, whereby the animating Spirit is much cramped in the Exercise of its Powers. A Child knows not what a Man does; for Reason gradually awakes, according to settled Laws of the human Constitution.—I would not be thought to speak *diminutively* of our Savior's Knowledge; for the Scripture ascribes to Him *all the Treasures*

Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, Col. ii. 3. A grand Expression indeed! But it should be remembered, that *it pleased the Father that all Fulness should dwell in Him*, Col. i. 19. So that He derived it from the Father, and depends on Him for the Continuance of it.

2. Our Lord's *Power* is inferior to the Father's, for it was communicated to Him by the Father as his Essence also was. Even all that inconceivable Stock of Power He exerted in the Creation of the Universe, and still exercises in the Course of Providence, is from the Father. *Heb. i. 2, 3. By whom He made the Worlds—Who (i.e. Christ) being the Brightness or Effulgence of his Father's Glory, and the express—Image of the Substance of Him (the Father) and Upholding all things by the powerful Word of Him (the Father) having by Himself made a Purgation of our Sins, &c.*

3. Our Savior's *Will* was inferior to the Father's, because subject to it. *Luke xxii. 42. Not my Will, but thine be done. John v. 30. I seek not my own Will, but the Will of the Father.* Hence our blessed

Lord performed a proper Obedience,
Rom. v. 19. Phil. ii. 8.

III. Our Savior's *Mission* from the Father is an Evidence of his Inferiority to Him.

Our Savior was sent by the Father, as He himself declares, *John xii. 49. For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father, who sent me, He gave me a Command what I should say, &c.* Jesus Christ who before his Incarnation was in Heaven, came down from thence, *not to do his own Will, but the Will of Him that sent Him, John vi. 38.*

IV. All our Blessed Lord's *Dominion* and Authority was derived from the Father, therefore He was inferior to the Father.

The Derivation of his Authority follows from the Derivation of his Being from the Father. (*Ax. I. Cor. III.*) The Subordination as well as Derivation of his Dominion is evident from hence, that He who *made him Head over all things, Eph. i. 22.* was Himself the *Head of Christ*, as Christ is the Head of every Man, *1 Cor. xi. 3.2* Again, the Father committed all Judgment to his Son,
John

John v. 22. who at the appointed time will deliver up to the Father all that Regal Jurisdiction he received from Him, *1 Cor.* xv. 24, 28. But as our Lord's Dominion is *derived*, so it is neither Universal nor Supreme as the Father's is. It is indeed vastly extensive, even co-extended with the rational Creation. His Dominion is not therefore *absolutely universal*, because of equal Extent with the Creation. For an Universal Dominion, properly speaking, is such as extends *over all Persons whatsoever, without exception*. But since God, who gave Jesus Christ his extensive Sway, must in all reason be exempted from the number of his Subjects, (*1 Cor.* xv. 27.) our Lord's Dominion cannot be Universal, and therefore not Supreme. His Right to rule us Men, and our Obligation to an unlimited Obedience to him, is uncontested; but let us ever remember who *constituted* him Heir of all things, *Heb.* i. 2. and highly exalted him, giving him a Name above every Name, *Phil.* ii. 9. lest when we confess by our Words and Actions that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, we rest in Him, and so rob the Father,

of whose Honour we ought to be very tender, of his unalienable Glory. The Primitive Fathers, at the same time they ascribe to our blessed Lord a Jurisdiction over the whole Creation, take care to inform us, that this is not an Original but a derived Authority. Consider *Mat.* xi. 27.—xxviii. 18. *Acts* ii. 36. *Heb.* ii. 8. *Phil.* ii. 9.

V. To conclude: The Son's own Confession puts his Inferiority to the Father past all Dispute. *John* xiv. 28. *My Father is greater than I.* For in whatever respect the Father is greater or superior to the Son, in that very respect the Son is *less* or inferior to the Father.—But though the Son be inferior to the Father, yet the *Grandeur* of his Person, and his *Beneficence* towards us, command our highest Admiration, Esteem and Gratitude. If any one from the Consideration of the Inferiority of the Son to the Father, think fit to call our Saviour a *Creature*, meaning nothing by that Term, but a derived Being, of indefinite Powers, subordinate to the First Cause, let me caution him in a friendly manner, lest, by an unguarded Application of the Term *Creature* to our blessed

bleſſed Lord, he inſenſibly entertains as low and diminutive an Idea of our great Deliverer as our Trinitarian Brethren have generally affixed to that Word. The Scripture never applies the Term *Creature* to our Lord; God is ſaid to Beget; not to Create Him. And the Fathers are for the moſt part cautious of ſaying, He was Created. He is deſcribed as exiſting *before all Creatures*, therefore himſelf not one of them.—He was a *God to every Creature*, and therefore no Creature. Let us always endeavour to promote in our Minds the higheſt Eſteem and Gratitude for him, to whom, under God, we owe all the Happineſs we enjoy now, or hope for hereafter. But yet as on the one hand, in point of Gratitude to ſo ſingular a Benefactor, we ſhould heartily rejoice in the Honour God has exalted him to in the higheſt Heavens; ſo on the other hand, in point of Duty to our God and his God, we ſhould not dare to adorn even a dying Redeemer with the incommunicable Glories of his God and Father.

COR. If Jeſus Chriſt be inferior to the Father, He wants thoſe *Qualifications*,
which

which render the Father his Superior ; consequently He is not *possessed of all Perfections*, and therefore is not properly *God*.

PROPOSITION IX.

The Holy Spirit is inferior to the Father and the Son.

I. **H**E is inferior to the Father.

1. As He is the *Minister* of the Father in the Revelation of his Will to Mankind. 1 Cor. ii. 10. *God hath revealed them unto us by the Spirit.*

2. The Holy Spirit intercedes with the Father for the Saints. Rom. viii. 26, 27. This is not only an evidence of distinct Personality, but also of Inferiority to the Father : for it were a Diminution to the Father to intercede with the Spirit : and there must be some Pre-eminence where there is place for Derogation.

3. The Holy Spirit is at the disposal of the Father.—As being given by Him. John xiv. 16. *And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Advocate*

cate—And as being *sent* by Him. John xiv. 26. *But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my Name.* There must be some Superiority expressed by the Terms *give* and *send*; else the Spirit might *as properly* be said to give or send the Father as the Father Him, which is an Absurdity surely no one will maintain.

II. The Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son.

1. He is represented as at the Disposal of the Son, as being *sent* by Him, from the Father. John xv. 26. *When the Comforter or Advocate comes, whom I will send unto you from the Father. If I depart I will send him unto you.*

2. As it is expressly denied of the Holy Spirit, that he should *speak of himself*; so it is expressly asserted of Him, that he should *speak* what he should *hear*; that he should *receive* of Christ and *shew* it to the Disciples; or in other words, that he should *receive* his *Message* or *Commission* from Christ. John xvi. 13, 14.

COR. Now since Christ is inferior to the Father, (*Prop. VIII.*) and the Holy Spirit Inferior to the Son, (*Prop. IX.*)
it

it follows that the Holy Spirit is, much more, inferior to the Father, consequently at a greater remove from Proper Godhead, which admits of no Inferiority at all. *Def. I. Cor. V.*

The Holy Spirit however is a Person of very high Eminence, Dignity, and Majesty, much superior to any Angel or Archangel, or any other Person whatsoever, excepting God the Father and his only-begotten Son. Let it then be considered, that however great and glorious, however mighty and powerful, however wise and knowing, however venerable and adorable, This Person is, and however intimate with and united to God the Father, whose Spirit He is; yet all that He is, and all that He does, is to be referred to Christ as the Author and Fountain of it.

PROPOSITION X.

The Father of Jesus Christ, and He alone, is properly God.

THE Father is Superior to the Son, (*Prop. VIII.*) and to the Spirit, (*Prop.*

(*Prop. IX.*) Therefore the Son and Spirit are excluded from Godhead by *Def. I. Cor. V.* as Inferiors. Since every Inferior wants that Perfection, which constitutes another his Superior. But God has all possible Perfections.

By *Ax. II.* God is either all three Persons; or only one of them. If *the One God* be *all three Persons*, He is a Compound of three Spirits, *two* of which are inferior to the *Third*, but this is an Absurdity. If *the One God* be *one only* of the Three, it must be the Father; because He is *superior* to the rest, and the *other Two* are excluded as *Inferiors*.

II. The Father is the *original Author* or First Cause of all things, and therefore God, by *Def. I. Cor. III.*

The Son is not the *First Cause*; for though our blessed Lord be spoken of as the Maker of all Things, *Job. i. 3.* *Col. i. 16.* Yet we know the Father made the Worlds by the Son, *Heb. i. 2.* and created all Things by Him, *Eph. iii. 9.* Hence I infer,

1. That the Son can be only a *Ministring* or Secondary Efficient Cause. *Def. I. Cor. III.*

2. That

2. That the Father is *Primary Efficient* or *First Cause* of all Things.

I go one step further; as *Christ* is the Author or Cause of the *Universe*, (Col. i. 16.) so the *Father* is the Author or Cause of the *Son*, (John vi. 57. I live by the Father) and therefore without doubt the First Cause. The *Holy Spirit* is not the *First Cause*; for if the Son made the Spirit (of which the Scripture makes no express mention) the latter is a Derivative Being, and so not the First Cause which is underived. And if the Son did not make the Spirit, since the latter has *derivative Powers*, He is a derivating Being, and therefore also not the First Cause: *Ax. I. Cor. III.* The Derivation of his *Powers* appears from *Prop. VII. and IX.*

III. The Father alone is *Self-existent*.

This follows from his being the *First Cause*, and is a Perfection inseparable from the Deity. *Def. I. Cor. I.*—The Son has a derivative Existence, as being *Begotten*. *Ax. I. Cor. II.* The *Holy Spirit* has derivative Powers, glorious however beyond Conception; and therefore is a derivative Being. *Cor. 3d.*

Ax.

Ax. I.—Since then the Son and Spirit are both *derived*, the Father alone can be *underived* and consequently *God*.

IV. The Father is the *Original* and *Supreme Governor* of all Things, and therefore *God* by *Def. I. Cor. IV.*

The Father is the Fountain of all that Authority and Dominion the Son is invested with. If by *Judgment*, John v. 22, be meant Rule or Sway, the Father committed it all to the Son; but if it be meant of the Judicial Process of the last and great Day of Judgment, the Father *ordained* the Son to be *Judge* of the Living and the Dead, *Acts* x. 42. xvii. 31. *Rom.* ii. 16.—It was the Father put all Things under Christ's feet, *1 Cor.* xv. 27, 28. made Him Head over all Things, *Eph.* i. 22. and gave all Things into his hand, *John* iii. 35. xiii. 3. So that our Saviour's *Dominion* is derived, and therefore *subordinate* to that of the Father, who must consequently be the only Original and Supreme Ruler, even of the Son himself.—The Holy Spirit never has *Dominion* ascribed to him in Scripture, much less *Supreme Dominion*.

minion. Neither do I ever find him called *God* in the Holy Writings.* To conclude: Since the Holy Spirit has *no Dominion* ascribed to him in Scripture, and the Son only *a subordinate one*; it follows that the Father is the Original and Supreme Governor of all Things.

V. The Father is represented in Scripture as the *God* as well as the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1.) By Christ *Himself*, John xx. 17. *I ascend unto my God and your God.* (2.) By St. Paul, Rom. xv. 6. 2 Cor. i. 3.—xi. 31. Eph. i. 3, 17. Col. i. 3. Heb. i. 8, 9. (3.) By St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 3. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* (4.) By St. John, Rev. i. 6. *And hath made us Kings and Priests to his God and Father.*

VI. Christ the faithful and true Witness expressly asserts the Father to be not only *God*; but the *only true God*.

[* As to Acts v. 3, 4. *Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God.*—The plain and obvious meaning of these words is, that attempting to deceive inspired persons was not barely the crime of attempting to deceive men, but was in effect an attempt to deceive God Himself, by whose Holy Spirit those men were inspired,]

John

John xvii. 3. *This is eternal Life, that they may know thee the only true God, and Him, whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.* Here our Saviour expressly distinguishes himself from the *only true God*, his Father, ver. 1. by another Character, viz. his Mission from the Father. St. Paul stiles the Father, the *one God of whom are all Things*, in contra-distinction to Jesus Christ the *one LORD by whom are all Things*, 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Eph. iv. 6. The Apostle calls the Father the *one God* and Father of all, who is above all, &c. as expressly distinguishes himself from the *one Lord*, and the *one Spirit*, mentioned ver. 4. 5. In this Text the Title of *one Lord* is indeed as much appropriated to Jesus Christ, as that of the *one God* is to the Father. So that as Jesus Christ the *one Lord* is excluded from being the *one God*; so the *one God*, the Father, is excluded from being the *one Lord*, and that for a very good reason, because it was God that made Jesus *Lord* as well as *Christ*. Acts ii. 36.

St. Peter stiles the Father of Jesus Christ *the God of Abraham, and of Isaac,*
and

*and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, the Jews, Acts iii. 13; and our Lord intimates that his Father was God of the Jews, John viii. 54. Now the God of Abraham, &c. was the God of the Jews, and the God of the Jews was the only true God; therefore the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true God.—*Since then the Father is superior to the Son and Spirit; since He is the original Author and supreme Governor of the Universe; since He is the God as well as the Father of Jesus Christ, nay the only true God, He is *God*, in the sense of *Def. I*; and consequently He alone; by *Ax. I.*

COR. If the Father alone be *God*, the Son and Spirit, being *distinct Persons* from Him, are excluded from proper Divinity; but being *Inferior* to Him, much more so.

Thus I have endeavoured to prove from holy Scripture, that *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three distinct Persons, of which the Father only is God.*—Now let the Reader try, what consistent Ideas he can form of the following Propositions, whereby our Trinitarian

nitarian Brethren express their Sentiments about this Momentous Point, of the Trinity.

I. *God is three Persons.* Waterland's Defence, p. 349.

If the word *Persons* expresses no determinate Idea, the Proposition has no Predicate, and therefore nothing is affirmed of the Subject.* If it signifies *Intelligent Agents*; viz. Spirits, then the Proposition will be reducible to this inconsistent one. *God, or the One intelligent Agent or Spirit, possessed of all possible*

* Dr. Watts allows the word *Person* signifies, in common language, *one single intelligent voluntary agent, or a principle of action that has understanding and will.* This use of the word would not suit his hypothesis, and therefore he uses it in a sense near a-kin to the common sense of the word. But what that sense is he does not inform us; only in general is satisfied, if we will allow such a distinction between the sacred Three, as is sufficient to support their distinct characters and Offices assigned to them in scripture. Chr. Doct. Trin. p. 145, 146, and Pref. p. vi.

When such considerable writers give us such inaccurate Explications of their terms, we must not wonder that authors of inferior abilities put us off with mere unmeaning words. The word *Person* is a plain *English* word; and should either not be used at all, or used in its true and proper sense.

Perfections,

Perfections, is three intelligent Agents or Spirits.

II. *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are three Persons, every one singly God, and all together one God. Waterland's Serm. p. 331. 2d Def. p. 314.*

God is a Spirit, Def. I. therefore if each Person be God, each Person is a Spirit; consequently the three Persons are three Spirits: and therefore three Gods, not one God. Just as three Persons, each of whom is a Man, would be three Men, not one Man. But does not the Notion of three Persons making *all together* the one God clash with the *Simplicity* of the Divine Being? Does it not represent the *one God* as a *Compound* made up of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as its Constituents? whereas God is a most *simple* or uncompounded Being. Def. I. Cor. II. and Def. II. Cor. IV.

III. *The Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and They are the One God. Waterland's 2d Def. p. 424.*

If the Father *together with* the Son and Spirit be God, how comes it to pass, that the Father *alone* is called God, that the Holy Ghost *alone* (according to them)

them) is called *God*? The way to know whether the word *God* be used in the same Sense, in the several Parts of this Proposition, is to substitute the Definition of *God* in the room of the Word itself. Thus *God* signifies a *Spirit of all possible Perfections*.—Now making the proper Substitution, the Proposition above will run thus: The *Father* is a Spirit of all possible Perfections, the *Son* (being a distinct Person) is another Spirit of all possible, &c. the *Holy Spirit* (being another Person) is another Spirit of all, &c. And yet They, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are the *one God*, viz. the one Spirit of all possible Perfections.—Now the *Son* and *Spirit* are not Spirits of all possible Perfections, being derived Beings of derived Powers and inferior to the *Father*.—And to say, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are each of them a Spirit, &c. that is, altogether are three Spirits, &c. and yet but one Spirit, &c. is a flat Contradiction. Now it is an allowed Maxim, that neither Reason nor Revelation requires us to believe plain Inconsistencies.—If it be said the Word *God* is used in two Senses, though

in the same Proposition, this possibly may remove the Contradiction; but why is this practised in violation of the established Rules of sound Reasoning, which requires the same Word to be used in the same Sense?

It is urged, "The Word *God* is sometimes taken essentially and sometimes personally." This is indeed a proper Distinction to serve an Hypothesis, but perfectly useless as to the conveying any real Knowledge; and calculated to confound the ignorant, nay the learned Reader too, when he is not fully upon his guard.—Though the main current of Scripture plainly declares Jesus Christ to be the Son of the *only true God*, yet there are some particular Texts, the misunderstanding of which has led some very pious Persons into the Notion of the supreme Deity of our blessed Savior.—However, it looks to me as if the Spirit of God, foreseeing the general Spread of the Trinitarian Scheme, and being zealous for the Peerless Majesty of the supreme Being, designedly guarded against it. For where any Texts seem to raise the Glory of Christ to an Equality with his
God

God and Father, we have always others directly calculated to cast a light on the former, and prevent their being misunderstood, when duly attended to.—The Texts of the former Class seem designed to aggrandize our Saviour, and to excite our Gratitude to express itself in the loftiest Sentiments of our great Deliverer, and the most active Obedience to Him, who being rich, for our sakes became poor, but is now exalted to the right Hand of the Majesty on high. The Texts of the latter Class, place God on the Throne, and teach us while we confess Jesus Christ as *Lord*, to do it to the Glory of God the Father. *Phil. ii. 11.*

I shall produce some Texts which speak loudly the Grandeur of our Saviour's Person, and show that They are far from proving his *Equality* with that God, who is the Author and Bestower of whatsoever He is and has.

I. John i. 1. *The WORD was with God and the WORD was God.*—Rom. ix. 5. *Christ—who is over all God blessed for ever, Amen.*

These and the like Passages, must be explained in a Manner consistent with

other Parts of the sacred Writings.— Now the Scripture can in no wise be thought to design by the term Θεός, when ascribed to Christ, an *Honour equal* to what it pays the Father by the term Θεός, because;

1. As the Son is a *distinct* Being from the Father (*Prop. VI*) were the former advanced to an equal Honour with the latter, by the term *God*, the Scripture would be chargeable with maintaining *two Gods*, contrary to Reason and its own express Declaration. For since the Father is *God*, *Prop. X.* in the Sense of *Def. I.* were the Son *God* in the same precise Sense, there must unavoidably be two Gods. What are *two Gods*, but two Beings to whom the same Definition of the word *God* evidently agrees?

2. The Scripture asserts the *Superiority* of the Father to the Son, *Prop. VIII.* Now since *Equality* is absolutely inconsistent with *Superiority*, the sacred Writers cannot be supposed, in this and the like Texts, to intend a full Equality.

3. An *equal Honour* cannot be concluded from the Word Θεός; because the Scripture gives the same Titles to
Angels

Angels and Men, who are inferior to Christ.—Now if the Works of Christ's Hands are called *Gods*, without advancing them to an Equality with Him, who is *their God*; why may not Christ himself, the only-begotten of the Father, be honoured with the Title of God, without advancing him to an Equality with *His God*?

4. An *equal Honour* cannot be intended by the Title *God*, because our Saviour's Divinity is *derived*; whereas the Father's Divinity is *underived*, which must certainly be more honourable.—If by *Deity* or Divinity, according to some, we understand *Authority or Dominion*, all our Saviour's Deity was derived, *Mat. xxviii. 18.*—*All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth.* If *Deity*, according to others, be referred to *Nature*; his Substance, consequently his Deity, was communicated to Him by the Father. *John vi. 57. I live by the Father.*

5. To secure the *supreme Honour* to the Father he is stiled, *ὁ Θεός*, whereas the Son is stiled only *Θεός*, without the Article.—This Emphatical Insertion of the Article (*ὁ*) when the Father is men-

tioned, and the designed Omission of it when another Person is spoken of, is taken notice of by several of the Fathers.

6. But effectually to prevent any ill Consequences arising from such a seemingly unguarded Application of the term Θεός to Jesus Christ, we are told, that this Son of God had a Person above Him, who is called *his God*. Heb. i. 8, 9. *But to the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever—therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows, or those that were Partakers with thee in Dominion, on which Account they might be called Gods.*

As to Rom. ix. 5. mentioned above, *God over all*, can signify no more than *Head over all*, Eph. i. 22, that is, *Ruler over all*. Now this *Headship* of Christ is either *Inherent and Original*; or *Communicated and Derived*. *Original* it cannot be, because God the Father gave Him to be Head over all Things, and put all Things under his Feet. And if it be *Communicated*, He whose it was originally, must be exempted from his Jurisdiction, 1 Cor. xv. 27. as being himself

himself Supreme. Hence the Dominion of our blessed Lord is neither *Universal*, i. e. without Exception, nor *Supreme*, i. e. Superior to all. Upon the whole, we see that Scripture hath sufficiently guarded against our *confounding* the Deity of the Son, with the Deity of the Father, or putting them on a *Level*.

II. John x. 30. *I and the Father are One.*

The judicious *Calvin* observes, “ this Text has been abused in being brought to prove the Son’s consubstantiality to the Father. For in this Place Christ is not speaking concerning the *Unity of Substance*, but of *Will*, or *Design**, which he has with the Father, that it might be manifest that all Things which Christ did, were done by Virtue of the Father who dwelt in *Him*.”

This Text fully proves our Saviour’s Power to secure his faithful ones from being overpowered and destroyed by their implacable Enemies. ’Tis as if he had said, “ It is one and the same Thing, whether you are in my Hand, or my Father’s, you shall be as effectually secured by me, as if God himself had

* So also he interprets, 1 John v. 7.

taken you under his immediate Care; for I and the Father are One, our Hearts and Hands are united in your Defence and Protection."

This Expression, *I and the Father are One*, does not prove our Saviour intended to make Himself *one Being* with the Father, any more than the like Expression will prove the collective Body of Christians *one Being*. * John xvii. 11.

Holy

* When the Jews charge our Lord Jesus with Blasphemy in making himself equal with God, John x. 33, how does he Answer the Charge? Does he say, *'tis true: I do make myself God, and I would be accounted the Supreme God, and of the very same Essence with the Father?* No such Thing, but he retreats to an inferior Sense of the Character of God, and Son of God; and then justifies his assuming it in that lower Meaning, v. 34, 35, 36. Jesus answered them, *Is it not written in your Law I said ye are Gods? If he called them (viz. Magistrates) Gods; say ye of him (not who is God by Nature, and in the same Essence, but) whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? q. d. Did I make myself God? or did I assume any more than your Law ascribes to Men in Authority? are not these stiled Gods, and Children of the Most High? and yet I who have a greater Commission and Authority than they from God, have only stiled myself SON of God, and ye quarrel with me as if I had blasphemously equalled*

Holy Father, keep these in thy Name, whom thou hast given to me, that they may be One, ^{as} We. So ver. 21. that they all may be One, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be One in us. So ver. 22. That they may be One, as we are One.

Here the *Oneness* of Believers amongst themselves is said to be as, *καὶ ὡς*, the Oneness of Christ and his Father. But Believers are not *one Being*; no, nor Christ and his Father; because *distinct Persons*. *Prop. VI.*

III. Col. ii. 9. In him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily. A grand Expression indeed, calculated to produce the highest Veneration for the sacred Person of our blessed Lord. But remember, Christians, that whatever *Fulness* our Saviour possesses, it *pleased the Father* that *all that Fulness* should dwell in Him. *Col. i. 19.* Hence it is evident this *Fullness* is derived from another, and therefore proves the Possessor of it inferior to the Father, who communicated it.

equalled myself to God, when I have assumed no more than you allow to your Magistrates without offence: How is mine blasphemy, if theirs be not so?

So that unless the same Thing can prove one Person both equal and inferior to another; this *Fulness of the Godhead* can never prove Christ equal to, much less the same Being with the Father, who is God, by *Prop. X.*

But further, Consider that *all the Fullness of the Godhead*, is of like import with *all the Fullness of God*, Eph. iii. 19. and therefore this Latter, which all Believers may be filled with, will prove them to be God, as strongly as the Former, which it pleased the Father should dwell in Christ, proves his supreme Godhead. But the one is absurd, therefore the other is so too.

IV. Col. i. 16. *For by Him were all Things created that are in Heaven, and that are on Earth, &c.* The Father indeed seems to appropriate this glorious Work of Creation to Himself. *Is. xlv. 24.*—And the Adoration the 24 Elders pay to Him that sat upon the Throne, was founded on his having created all Things. *Rev. iv. 11.*—However, St. Paul expressly ascribes Creation to Jesus Christ, Col. i. 16. as St. John has done the making of all Things. *John i. 3.*—
But

But are we under a necessity of concluding from hence, that the Son is *equal* to the Father, or the *same Being* with Him? Surely No.—If then the Father be the only Creator, how comes Jesus Christ to be the Subject of Creative Powers? I answer, Christ may properly be said *to create*, if the Father communicated Creative Powers to Him, and actually created all Things by Him. *Eph. iii. 9. Heb. i. 2.*—Thus the Father has the *Pre-eminence* of being the Person *Of whom are all Things*, and the Son is really the Person *By whom are all Things*; or in plain *English*, the Father is *primarily* Creator, and the Son *secondarily* or *sub-ordinately*. And what wonder is it, that the same work of Creation is ascribed to the Father, who was Superintendant and Director; and to the Son, who was his Agent and Minister?—Indeed, strictly speaking the Act of the Son, who is a distinct Person from the Father, is not the Act of the Father. And the Father and Son cannot, in the same respect, be said to perform the same individual Actions; yet *common Speech* will justify the predicating the same Action of two

Persons; when *they both* had a concern in it; when the one communicated the Ability of doing it to the other; when the one ordered and directed, the other officiated and acted under the first, as his Minister and Agent. *Ax. VII.*—And as common Speech justifies this Manner of Expression, so the Scripture being written in the common, not in the Philosophical Language, is not to be supposed to use all the Accuracy of a Mathematicial Discourse. It speaks as the common People talk, not as Mathematicians write. *Ex. Gr.* when it speaks of the *Sun's standing still*, and when it ascribes *Bodily Parts and Actions* to God, &c.—I might add, that if in strict Propriety of Speech the Father *only* did create, according to *Is. xlv. 24.* and every other Person be excluded from any Concern in the Work of Creation, then the Son did not create *at all*, contrary to the above cited Texts, unless He is the Father. Whereas He is proved a distinct Being from the Father. *Prop. VI.*

V. John xvi. 30. *Now we know that thou knowest all Things*, xxi. 17. *Lord, thou knowest all Things.*

Here

Here a *proper Omniscience* is supposed to be ascribed to our blessed Lord, even such an Omniscience as argues his supreme Deity.—But that Jesus Christ is not *equal* to his God and Father in point of Knowledge, will appear from the following Considerations impartially weighed.—Proper Omniscience is as really a peculiar and incommunicable Attribute of God as Omnipotence. For if *unlimited* Knowledge be a greater Perfection than *limited*, it is peculiar to God, by *Def. I.* And if God be the only infinite Spirit, He only is the Subject of infinite Knowledge, consequently it can properly be predicated of *no other* Person, and therefore not of our blessed Saviour, who is another. But further, Our Saviour expressly disclaimed the Characters of an Omniscient Being, *Mark* xiii. 32, and ascribed a Knowledge to the Father, which he himself was a Stranger to.—Moreover, God is, in express Words, said to *give him a Revelation* of future Events, which surely implies his Ignorance of them, till thus revealed to him. See *Rev.* i. 1.—Besides, the Inference the Apostles draw from this Ascription

Ascription of Omniscience, viz. that they believed *He came from God*, John xvi. 30. clearly shows they meant only an Extensive, but not an unlimited Knowledge. Again, Our Saviour's Followers are said to be *taught all Things*, John xiv. 26. to be *guided into all Truth*, John xvi. 13. to have an *Uction from the Holy One*, and to *know all Things*, 1 John ii. 20. Now would any one from these Phrases infer the proper Omniscience of the Saints, I am apt to think, he would be confuted by the Experience of every one of them.—Whoever is acquainted with the Eastern way of addressing their Superiors, knows it was a common Compliment paid to their great Men and Prophets, to tell them, *They knew all Things*; that is, their Knowledge was very extensive—The high Notion the Woman of *Samaria* had of the Messiah's Knowledge, is expressed by his *Telling all Things*, John iv. 25. and yet this Woman had no thought of ascribing Deity to the expected Messiah. Somewhat like this we find in the Woman of *Tekoah's* Speech to *David*, 2 Sam. xiv. 20. *My Lord is wise according to the Wisdom of an*

an Angel of God, to know all Things that are on the Earth.

These Things considered, it is plain the Apostles could not consistently with our Saviour's Declaration, and the Reason of Things, ascribe a *proper Omniscience* to their Master.—I would not be understood to speak, or even think, any Thing lessening or degrading of the Knowledge of Christ Jesus, my powerful Creator and unwearied Benefactor, in whom are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, who searches the Reins and Hearts, who knew all Men and what was in Man, who was the Word of God, in whose sight every Creature is manifest, to whose Eyes all Things are naked and manifest, who made all Things, and of course must know what Powers he gave to his own Works. But yet in justice to Scripture and Truth, I must give the Precedence to his God and Father in respect of Knowledge, both as to the Degree and Communication of it.

VI. Heb. i. 6. *Let all the Angels of God worship Him.*—In *Psal. xcvi. 7.* whence this is thought to be taken, we read thus,
Worship

Worship Him all ye Gods.—The Reason why the Angels are called his [Christ's] Fellows (says Mr. Peirce on Hebr. i. 9.) must be fetched from what they were before, and not what they were after his being anointed or inaugurated. After his being anointed, they were no longer his Fellows, but his Subjects; but before it, they were Partners or Sharers with him in the Government of the World, they presiding over their respective Provinces, as he did over Israel. See the same Writer on Col. ii. 15. Perhaps in this Sense of Dominion, or on account of this Authority they exercised over their respective Provinces, the Angels may be called Gods in the Old Testament. Though it is observable that in the New Testament, they never have Godhead or Dominion ascribed to them.

Qu. Whether upon God's having introduced his First-begotten, the Messiah, into the World, the good Angels were not divested of that Dominion and Authority which gave them a Right to the Title of Gods, under the Old Testament Dispensation, Col. ii. 15. Hebr. i. 9?—And, whether it was not in token of their

their voluntarily Subjection to this Great Personage, that they were commanded to *worship* Him, *Heb. i. 6.* that is, to pay him *Homage* as their lawful Sovereign, set over them by his Heavenly Father. *Pf. ii. 6, 7?*—If these *Queries* be answered in the affirmative, the Reader will easily see the Reason of their losing the Title of *Gods* upon the Expiration of that Authority, which was the sole Foundation of it.

Was not Jesus Christ *worshiped* on Earth by those, who never entertain'd a Thought of his being the *most high God*? *Mat. ii. 11.* The *Magi* worshiped him as *King of the Jews*, ver. 2.—xiv. 33. His Disciples worship'd him as the *Son of God*.—*Mar. v. 6.* The Demoniac ran and worshiped him as the Son of God, ver. 36.—Is there any Example of our Lord's being *worshiped* even after his Ascension, unless when *seen in full View*? Was He *directly addressed* to by *Stephen*, *Acts vii. 59?* the blessed Martyr saw the *Son of Man standing on the right Hand of God*, ver. 55.—As for *Rev. v. 13.* It was a *Vision*, not a Precept, nor an Example proposed for our Imitation.

Whether

Whether the Holy Scriptures oblige Christians to, or countenance them in, *direct Addresses* to Jesus Christ, is a Subject worthy the serious Consideration of every conscientious Unitarian.

The Miracles of our blessed Saviour, and his sitting as Judge in the judicial Proceedings of the last and great Day of Account, have been urged as strong Evidences of his proper Divinity; therefore I thought proper to say something to each of them, that so I might remove these Difficulties out of the Way of pious Persons, who lay too much stress on them.

I. Our Saviour's Miracles are numerous, evident, and astonishing; but no proper Evidence of supreme Godhead in the Performer of them; for,

1. They were Works which the Father had *given*, that is, enabled or commissioned the Son to perform, and were such as *bore witness* of Him, *that the Father had sent him*. John v. 36. x. 25. The Inference our Lord draws from this mighty Power exerted by himself, *viz.* *that the Father had sent him*, would lose all its force on supposition of its being originally

originally in him. A Power inherent and underived can by no means infer such a Mission, though one communicated or derived may.—Though God may justly be said *to do* what he enables another to perform, yet had our Saviour's Miracles required a Power to the Performance of them, superior to what God could communicate, even to his only-begotten Son; He himself could not properly be said to be the Doer of them, but God only. For no Being can exert greater Power than it *has* or is *capable of receiving*. No finite Being can perform an Action, which requires infinite Power to the Performance of it; because infinite Power is incommunicable to such a Being.

2. It is upon Account of the Assistance God gave to Christ in working his Miracles, that He is said to be with him. *Acts* x. 38. Nay, so careful is our Saviour to give his Father the Glory of those mighty Works, that he says, *The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the Works*, *John* xiv. 10. as though because He performed them by a borrowed Power he had no Hand in them.—To
this

this add St. Peter's Words, *Acts ii. 22.* *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, which God did by Him*—Now if God did these Miracles by Jesus Christ, I infer, Christ wrought them by a Communicated, not by an inherent Power, which cannot be said of God, without a manifest Absurdity.

3. The Followers of our Saviour in the Miracles they wrought, could only exert a finite Power, and yet our Lord says, They should, or might do *greater Works* than He. *John xiv. 12*, consequently his own were no convincing Evidence of his Divinity.

I observe a difference in the Style of Scripture when speaking of the Apostles Miracles.—One while, Signs and Wonders were wrought by the Hands of the Apostles, *Acts v. 12.* and *Stephen* did great Wonders and Miracles, *Acts vi. 8.* Another while, God wrought Miracles and Wonders by *Barnabas* and *Paul*, *Acts xv. 12.* God wrought special Miracles by the Hands of *Paul*. *Acts xix. 11.*

4. The Spectators of our Saviour's Miracles, constantly ascribed them to a
Power

Power foreign to Him. They were too well acquainted with the Miracles of *Moses*, and others of their own *Prophets*, whom they knew to be Men like themselves, to argue any Thing more than an extraordinary Assistance in the Case of our blessed Lord.—*Nicodemus*, upon a Conviction of Jesus's Ability to work Miracles, came to him by Night, and after an Acknowledgment of his being a Teacher come from God, argues thus; *for no one can do these Miracles that thou doest, except God be with him*, John iii. 2. Upon the Multitudes seeing a Cure wrought on the Paralytic, *They wondered, and glorified God, who had given such Power unto Men*. Mat. ix. 8.—So upon the raising a Widow's Son from the dead, *Fear came on all, and they glorified God, saying, that a great Prophet is risen up among us; and, that God hath visited his People*. Luke vii. 16.—None of these Persons conclude the Author of these Miracles to be God; but the *one* argues that, He was a Teacher come from God, and that God was with him; the *others*, that God must give him Power, and that a Prophet was risen among

among them. If the Reader consults the following Texts, *Mat.* xv. 31. *Mark* ii. 12. *Luke* v. 25, 26.—xiii 13.—xvii. 15.—xviii. 43.—he will see how frequently Glory is given to God, on Account of Miracles wrought by Christ; and that not only by the Spectators, but by the Persons themselves, who received the Benefit of them. Neither did the Holy Jesus think this Glory misplaced, though transferred from himself to his Father.—One of the most considerable of our Saviour's Miracles was his raising the dead. Now he claims to himself a *Power* not only of raising others from the dead, but himself also, *John* x. 18. and without doubt his Claim was just; but yet this Power being derived, his Claim to it is in no wise repugnant to those Texts whence I proved his own Derivation from the First Cause. Nay, his owning the Receipt of this Power from the Father, naturally leads us to ascribe the Glory of the original Communication and Restoration of Life to the Father only.

Our

Our Lord's Power to raise others is evident from his having *Life in Himself*, and the Derivation of this Power is proved from hence, that the Father gave to the Son to have Life in himself. *John* v. 26.—His Power to raise himself is expressed *John* ii. 19.—x. 18. and the Derivation of this Power is evident from *Ax.* I. *Cor.* III. for a derived Being can have only derived Powers. However, though Christ had undoubtedly a Power to raise Himself from the dead, it does not appear that *in fact* he did so. For the Scripture never *Historically* relates this remarkable Event, as performed by the Son himself; but perpetually declares that the Father did *Actually* raise him up from the dead, either immediately by Himself, or mediately by the Holy Spirit.—St. *Peter* asserts this, *Acts* iii. 13, 15, 26. and St. *Paul*, *Gal.* i. 1.—St. *Paul* intimates the Apostles should be false Witnesses of God, if he had not raised up Jesus Christ. *1 Cor.* xv. 15. The Apostle's reasoning requires this Resurrection to be performed by the Father, *Eph.* i. 17, 19, 20. *That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ—according*
to

to the working of his mighty Power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right Hand, &c. 2 Cor. iv. 14. Gal. i. 1. Heb. xiii. 20, 21.

But after all, if any one insist upon the *Future Verb*, *ἐγερω*, John ii. 19. rendered *I will raise up*, as an Evidence that our Lord intended to predict what He *would* do, and not barely to express what He *could* do, I desire him maturely to consider,

1. That *Verbs* expressing an *Action*, though in the *future Tense*, frequently denote an *Ability* of doing that Action, rather than the *Actual Futurity* of it. See Gen. xvi. 10. 1 Kings iii. 8. Ex. iv. 14. 1 Sam. xxviii. 2. 2 Sam. xix. 36. Job v. 12.—xxii. 2, 13. Ps. xxii. 18. Prov. xx. 9. Is. xlix. 15. Jer. v. 22. Mat. xii. 31.

2. The Jews seem thus to have understood our blessed Lord, John ii. 20. They could not conceive that He *was able* to rebuild that Temple in the space of three Days, which had been Forty-six Years in building.—And what the false Witnesses express by *I will destroy*,
and

and *I will build*, Mark xiv. 58. is in St. *Matthew*, *I am able to destroy—and build*, &c.

3. If this was a real Prediction, it would certainly have been accomplished; and if it had been accomplished, it had doubtless been related.—Is it likely, that if our blessed Lord had told the Jews he would certainly raise himself, *Job. ii. 19.* the Apostles should constantly tell them in their Sermons, that the Father raised him; that is (as the Jews must understand them) that he did not raise himself?—It is likely, that if the Apostles remembered our Saviour had told them, he would actually raise himself, *Job. ii. 22.* they would never once have informed the succeeding Christians, that he really did so; but on the contrary, have frequently taught them that his Father raised him, and even have argued on that Supposition? *Eph. i. 17, 20.* *1 Pet. i. 21.*—So that it does not appear, it ever entered into the Apostles thoughts, that their Master raised himself, nor do they ever mention this as a past Fact.

II. Our Lord Jesus Christ's sitting as Judge in the final Judgment, is no Evidence of his being the supreme God.

From such Texts as *Rom. xiv. 10.* *2 Cor. v. 10.* which represent our Saviour as the universal Judge, some argue, that He must be *God*; because the Process of that Day requires Powers superior to what any Creature can be possessed of. I allow the *Final Judgment* to be one of the most awful of our Lord's Regal Acts, whether we regard the Grandeur and Solemnity of it, or the important Consequences of the respective Sentences that shall be passed on Good or Bad Men. — But then remember that He is *ordained* by *God* a Judge of the Living and the Dead, *Acts x. 42.* and that *God* will judge the World by that Man, whom he has ordained, *Acts xvii. 31.* and that *God* will judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, *Rom. ii. 16.* We know indeed that God shall in *Person* judge no one, but has committed all Judgment to the Son, *John v. 22.* and it is fit our Lord should receive a large Revenue of Glory on that account; for this Honour

has

has the Father conferr'd on the Son, That all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father, ver. 23.—Our Saviour's *Qualifications* for this Office are evident from the Father's ordaining him to the discharge of it: but from the Father's appointing the *Son* to execute it; we may infer, that *properly Divine Powers* are not requisite to the Execution of it. For the Son is inferior to the Father, and therefore not *God*.

But should any one yet imagine that the Honour with which Christ is invested, is *equal to the Father's*, He may be convinced of his Mistake by asking himself, Whether a Judge in an *human Assize* has a right to the same or equal Honour with the King, who grants him his Commission? And, is not the Respect paid to a Judge on the Bench, founded on the Royal Commission under which he acts?

The only Inference then that can justly be drawn from the Father's committing all Judgment to the *Son*, is, that all Men should honour him *as well as the Father*,

not that they should honour him *as much as* the Father, *John v. 23.* For a delegated Authority can never command equal Respect with that from whence it is derived.

What remains, but to exhort my Readers to act like Men, that are accountable for the use of their reasonable Powers? Let them first examine the Scripture-Revelation, and judge for themselves whether its Pretensions to a Divine Authority are just or no; and then let them explain its Contents in a consistency with itself, and the divine Perfections of its Author.

Thus Faith will follow their Understanding, which at first is the more natural Order, afterwards indeed the Understanding may be opened and dilated by the humble and gradual Admission of revealed Truths.

The more important the Subject of this Discourse may seem, the rather should my serious Readers endeavour to make themselves Masters of it; and not suffer themselves to be hurried away with the Authority of great Names, whether Antient or Modern, nor byassed by

by Education, Custom or Interest, to satisfy themselves with their present Attainments.

Let us all diligently read our Bibles, that we may be better acquainted with God and ourselves, that we may know our Master's Will, in order to a Conscientious Compliance with it.

And if to this we add fervent Prayers to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that for the sake of his dear Son, he would grant us the Assistances of his Holy Spirit, we may hope not only to be secured from every destructive Error, but led into every Truth necessary to the faithful Discharge of our Duty, and the final Possession of Eternal Life.

F I N I S.



Postscript.

IT may be proper to inform such Readers as are not acquainted with the former Edition of the preceding Work, that the several *Definitions, Propositions, &c.* are there supported by numerous Quotations from the Fathers, and the best Modern Trinitarian Writers.

If any should object to this Work, that no Notice is taken of that common and popular Argument for the supream Deity of Christ, the Ascription of the same Names, Characters, and Works to him in Scripture, as are there represented peculiar to Deity, they may see the futility of this Argument exposed, and the usual Texts clearly explained, in a Work, entitled, *A Full Answer to the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity proved, &c. by the Rev. W. JONES.* Printed for Johnson, in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1772.

E R R A T A.

Page 19, l. 11, read *unprejudiced.*

105, l. 9. for *καθως* read *καθως.*

N. B. In p. 11, l. 8, "He had" refers to Mr. Thomas Scott, last mentioned.

9011109

[The page contains faint, illegible markings.]

A circular ink stamp from the British Museum is centered on the page. The words "BRITISH" and "MUSEUM" are curved along the top and bottom inner edges of the circle, respectively. In the center of the circle, the date "14JY74" is stamped in a straight line. The background of the page shows faint, illegible text from the reverse side.



ТАЯ

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a record of some kind. The names are written in a cursive script, and the dates are in a more formal, printed style. The list is organized into two columns, with names on the left and dates on the right.